DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 272 495 SP 027 911

TITLE	H.R. 747, The Effective Schools Development in Education Act of 1985. Hearing before the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Ninety-Ninth Congress, Second Session on H.R. 747 To Amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 To Establish a Program To Promote More Effective Schools and Excellence in Education, and for Other Purposes.
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. House Committee on Education and Labor.
PUB DATE	4 Mar 86
NOTE	45p.; Serial No. 99-83.
AVAILABLE FROM	Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402.
PUB TYPE	Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Curriculum Development; *Educational Improvement; Educational Innovation; *Educational Legislation; Government Role; *Policy Formation; School Administration; *School Effectiveness

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this hearing was to present testimony on the concept of effective schools and to discuss the Effective Schools Development in Education Act of 1985, H.R. 747. This report includes statements from: (1) Dr. Robert N. Fortenberry, superintendent of the Jackson (Mississippi) Municipal Separate School District; (2) Dr. Eric Cooper, associate director of the College Board; (3) Dr. Dale Mann of the Columbia University Teachers College; (4) Dr. Herman Meyers of the College of Education and Social Services, University of Vermont; and (5) Dr. Benjamin Turner, director of the Kent State Center for Education Development, Kent State University. Prepared statements, letters and supplemental materials were provided by the witnesses. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED272495

H.R. 747, THE EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS DEVELOPMENT IN EDUCATION ACT OF 1985

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-NINTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

H.R. 747

TO AMEND THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965 TO ESTABLISH A PROGRAM TO PROMOTE MORE EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS AND EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

HEARING HELD IN WASHINGTON, DC, MARCH 4, 1986

Serial No. 99-83

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

59-369 O WASHINGTON : 1986

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office
U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402

SP027911

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California, *Chairman*

WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY, Missouri
MARIO BIAGGI, New York
AUSTIN J. MURPHY, Pennsylvania
DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan
PAT WILLIAMS, Montana
MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, California
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
RICK BOUCHER, Virginia
CHARLES A. HAYES, Illinois
CARL C. PERKINS, Kentucky
TERRY L. BRUCE, Illinois
STEPHEN J. SOLARZ, New York
MERVYN M. DYMALLY, California
DENNIS E. ECKART, Ohio
TIMOTHY J. PENNY, Minnesota
CHESTER G. ATKINS, Massachusetts

JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont
WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
E. THOMAS COLEMAN, Missouri
THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin
MARGE ROUKEMA, New Jersey
STEVE GUNDERSON, Wisconsin
STEVE BARTLETT, Texas
ROD CHANDLER, Washington
THOMAS J. TAUKE, Iowa
JOHN R. McKERNAN, JR., Maine
RICHARD K. ARMEY, Texas
HARRIS W. FAWELL, Illinois
PAUL B. HENRY, Michigan

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California, *Chairman*

WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan
PAT WILLIAMS, Montana
RICK BOUCHER, Virginia
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, California
CARL C. PERKINS, Kentucky
STEPHEN J. SOLARZ, New York
DENNIS E. ECKART, Ohio

WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
HARRIS W. FAWELL, Illinois
ROD CHANDLER, Washington
JOHN R. McKERNAN, JR., Maine
RICHARD K. ARMEY, Texas
STEVE GUNDERSON, Wisconsin
(Ex Officio)

CONTENTS

	Page
Hearing held in Washington, DC, on March 4, 1986	1
Statement of:	
Cooper, Dr. Eric, associate director, program development, the College Board	27
Fortenberry, Dr. Robert N., superintendent, Jackson Municipal Separate School District, Jackson, MS	17
Mann, Dr. Dale, Teachers College, Columbia University	21
Meyers, Dr. Herman, College of Education and Social Services, University of Vermont	3
Turner, Dr. Benjamin, director, Kent State Center for Education Development, Kent State University	13
Prepared statements, letters, supplemental materials, et cetera:	
Cooper, Dr. Eric J., associate director, program development, the College Board, prepared statement of	31
Fortenberry, Dr. Robert N., superintendent Jackson Municipal Separate School District, Jackson, MS, prepared statement of	20
Mann, Dr. Dale, professor and senior research associate, Center for Education and the American Economy, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, NY, prepared statement of	26
Meyers, Dr. Herman, associate professor and director, Vermont School Improvement Institute, College of Education and Social Services, University of Vermont, prepared statement of	7
Turner, Dr. Benjamin, director, Kent State Center for Educational Development and Strategic Services, prepared statement of	15

H.R. 747, THE EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS DEVELOPMENT IN EDUCATION ACT OF 1985

TUESDAY, MARCH 4, 1986

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY,
AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Washington, DC.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 9:30 a.m., in room 2175, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Augustus F. Hawkins (chairman) presiding.

Members present: Representatives Hawkins, Kildee, Owens, McKernan, and Gunderson.

Also present: Representative Jeffords.

Staff present: John Jennings, counsel; John Smith, special assistant to the chairman; Nancy Kober, legislative specialist; Andrew Hartman, Republican legislative associate.

Chairman HAWKINS. The Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education is called to order. The Chair would like to make a brief statement at the beginning of the hearing as to the purpose of the hearing.

Today, it is our intent to hear testimony on a subject that is extremely interesting and which holds great promise for our schools and our children, the concept of effective schools. Over the past 15 years, dedicated researchers and educators have been studying the characteristics of schools which are effectively teaching the Nation's children.

The result of this impressive body of research has been the identification of five or more characteristics which distinguish effective from ineffective schools. Encouraged by the finding that schools can make a difference in a child's achievement, a number of schools and school districts have implemented school improvement programs based on effective school principles.

What is an effective school? An effective school is orderly and safe. Its principal is not just an administrator. He or she is a leader who takes an interest in the quality of instruction; the mastery of basic and higher order skills is a school's prime focus. Teachers in effective schools have the expectation that all students will learn. It is a school in which an equal percentage of children from highest and lowest socioeconomic groups achieve at least a minimum level of academic mastery.

Based on these promising factors, I introduced the Effective Schools Development in Education Act of 1985, H.R. 747. The pur-

pose of this legislation is to encourage and assist local and State education agencies in broadening and approving effective schools' programs.

I am pleased to say that H.R. 747 already has over 130 cosponsors. I look forward to the hearing testimony this morning from respected educators who are helping to make a difference in the lives of our children through implementation of effective school principle and programs. I would like to at this time yield to my distinguished colleague, Mr. Jeffords, the ranking minority member in case he has a comment to make. It is my understanding also that he is involved in one of the other subcommittee hearings this morning, and that it will be his privilege to introduce one of the most distinguished educators present today and also an educator who represents the great State of Vermont. At this time, I will yield to our distinguished colleague, Mr. Jeffords.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't know that I need to do any more of an introduction than that, but I would like to welcome Dr. Herman Meyers to our subcommittee today, and I look forward to hearing about the good things that he has been helping Vermont do. Dr. Meyers is an associate professor and director of the Vermont School Improvement Institute, College of Education and Social Services at the University of Vermont.

Mr. Chairman, in the 1970's, we began to hear that schools don't make a difference in affecting the lives of students. While this did not make sense to many of us, it was educational researchers and practitioners, like Dr. Meyers, who did the work which proved this statement false.

The effective schools research showed that schools do make a difference. The effective schools center in Vermont has been very active and also has done some interesting things which have not been done in some other places by also utilizing these techniques and policies in vocational education in schools as well.

This sense of hope and promise makes the fight to improve schools that much easier. I would also like to say that Vermont, in the latest reports, came out second in the Nation in the ability of its students in the examinations for college preparations. So with that, I would be very happy to welcome Dr. Meyers here to testify today.

Chairman HAWKINS. Dr. Meyers, we welcome you, and I would ask you to sit at the witness table, and we will proceed to hear from you. Then, it's my understanding that several of the other witnesses have arrived. We will call upon them subsequent to your testimony. As our colleague, Mr. Jeffords has said, we welcome the remarks you will make, particularly as they apply to a State which is in some ways unique in that it does not represent the great urban areas that some of us represent. So it is a little different from some of the others, and for that reason, I think your testimony will be enjoyed because of its uniqueness. Thank you. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF DR. HERMAN MEYERS, COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND SOCIAL SERVICES, UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT

Dr. MEYERS. Thank you, Chairman Hawkins, Congressman Jeffords, distinguished members of the committee, what I would like to talk about this morning, my remarks are in four areas. I won't read you the prepared statement that I have, but I will attempt to summarize those comments for you. The background that I come from in Vermont is, as you well know, a rural State, and for many years we in Vermont have been concerned about the support that we receive or don't receive in rural education.

In addition to being the director of this school improvement institute and working at the University of Vermont, I'm also a school board member in a rural school district, and today, as I sit here testifying, my people are deciding the fate of my school district. The budget will either go up or down, and we will either have a teacher strike in the fall or we will not, depending upon how the voters are deciding at this very hour our budget will go.

It's that backdrop of the shortage of resources in a rural State where, as you know, dairy herds are being sold off, where as you know property values have radically, drastically changed in the past 10 years and have affected the way in which we fund and support public education.

In 1983, then Secretary Terrel Bell made several commitments to rural education in this country, and I won't read all of his commitments to you from that August 23 statement, but we were very encouraged at that time by what we thought would be support for research and development which we felt were related to school effectiveness and the application of the principles of the research that we had come to know in rural schools.

Our rationale for applying that research in rural schools came from a study done in 1973 by Klitgaard and Hall for the Carnegie Corp. One of the interesting findings of that study was that when one looked at the effectiveness of rural schools, as judged by those outcome measures of standardized test scores, one could only explain about 7 percent of the variation in achievement by what we call the standard regressor variables. In other words, one could only, when look at the two size, the population that explained about 93 percent of the variation.

The conclusion one draws from that is there is something unique and special about rural schools in the way that they treat public education. At that point, Klitgaard and Hall decided to remove all the rural schools from the Carnegie setting, because of this unique set of circumstances in the variation, and so from there on, I think you'll find in the literature most of the educational research bears on suburban and urban schools.

Now what we've tried to do in Vermont is to fill that gap. We brought Ron Edmonds to Vermont in 1981 to speak with him about the so-called characteristics of effective schools and began something we call the Vermont School Improvement Institute.

In the years that following Ron's coming for that institute, we attempted to take his five characteristics of effective schools and to test whether or not we could find those characteristics in rural schools. It turns out that we could.

We also spoke with and invited up the people from Connecticut, Bill Gauthier, whose comments you may have read in "Education Week" in, I think the January 15 issue. They added a couple of more characteristics which we also tested in our schools. Again, we found some interesting differences which I'll go into in a minute, but it occurred to us that there was generalization, that you could explain what some rural schools were effective and other schools were not effective by looking at the way in which the teachers perceived these characteristics that Ron Edmonds had identified.

We felt that it was not enough to just perform research on rural schools, but what we needed to do since Vermonters are folks who like to see you doing something besides studying them to death was to form the institute to try to help these schools, the ones that we found that were not effective become more effective.

We came up with a nine-step process which begins with a request from a school administrator for information on effective schools research and school assessment. When we get that request, we then go to step two, which is to work with the building staff and give them that information during a presentation. Once we do that, we then begin what we call a formal needs assessment process.

We interview every teacher in the school. You may have heard this from some of the other researchers and the people who work with these schools, but we interviewed every teacher in the school for about an hour.

During that interview, we asked them very specific pointed questions about each of the seven characteristics that we have identified as being predictive of an effective school. In the fourth step, we analyze that information and put it together. We go into their achievement records and analyze the achievement records. We disaggregate their achievement data by social class, by ethnic background. In Vermont, many of our people are concerned about the effects that the French language has in the northern communities on people achievement so we disaggregate the data there by family background to see whether they're not at all levels. Over a long period of time, we take our data for 3 to 5 years in order to establish the trends, about whether or not the school is effective.

We disaggregate it by sex. We look at whether or not students have an equal chance of achieving the minimum mastery of skills by sex. We then ask the teachers in the school and the community whether or not there is any other way that they would like to have the data disaggregated to find out whether or not the school is effective. We've had them ask questions like what about the December babies. If kids are allowed to come to school too early, and they have a difficult time, does that mean that they're going to be held back in the second, third, and fourth grade, and so we replicate that research for them that's been done, as you know many times.

Anything, right and lefthandedness, there was one school that said we don't provide enough left-handed scissors for our kids in the second grade, and we'd like to know whether or not that makes a difference, so we disaggregate the data that way. It's a process of looking very carefully over a long period of time at what the outcomes of schooling area.

In the next step, we feed that back to the staff, and they then begin a process of deciding whether or not to do action planning

based on the results of the data that we give them. When they decide that, they then begin to design inservice education for teachers and purchase the kinds of materials they need in order to carry out their action plans.

The final step is to design an evaluation plan for them they can then know whether or not they've made any difference. We've learned some lessons from this process that I wanted to share with you. With respect to the implementation, one of the things that we've learned is that the process of doing this evaluation, this assessment is probably the most important product that you can gain out of a school improvement program based on the effective schools characteristics. In other words, it's that process of interviewing those teachers for that long period of time, talking with them, each one individually.

It gets them involved. It gets them to buy into what is going to follow. So it becomes an honest response to real concerns raised in the assessment process. Second, the process has both short-term and long-term goals in an evaluation scheme, and, third, the process involves substantial amounts of teacher inservice, but that inservice has a clear rationale in the assessment process. If, for example, you ask a teacher why he or she is learning mastery education, Bloom's Mastery Model, you then get a very specific answer that links that type of inservice to the findings of the assessment process.

We have seen many inservice initiatives die what we think is an ugly death when they were clearly in response to a bandwagon rather than concerns that are validated by teachers. Finally, the process is assisted, but not controlled, by an outside change agent or facilitator. We can confirm that findings that Dale Mann, I think, will talk about later, that Matt Miles had found in our behalf, that an outside change agent who works with these schools through the process is an essential piece of what needs to happen.

We're now in the process of adapting this research to rural vocational centers, and while we're only in the third month of our field work with them, we think we can make the following observations, we do make the following observations.

The characteristics of rural effective schools identified earlier seem to generalize to the vocational centers. Two, outcome measures include job performance as well as postgraduate placement, in addition to other more transitional measures of academic achievement. One of the really interesting things that we found out is that Federal guidelines for specifying outcome measures for vocational centers require that many of what we consider and the teachers consider to be positive outcomes are indicated as negative outcomes in the reports which go to the state and Federal level.

For example, if a student in a vocational center goes into the military, that's indicated as a negative outcome. If a student gets a job in an area which may be closely allied to the area that he or she was trained for, but not the exact program that he or she was in while they were at the center, that's indicated as a negative outcome, and so the vocational centers are roundly criticized for what turns out to be about a 93.5-percent job placement rate for 28-year-olds, and for us, in a State where over the past 10 years, that's ranged as high as 22 percent unemployment rate, that's a very

high positive outcome. It is not seen as a positive outcome by many of the people who judge vocational centers.

Vocational centers because of their regional nature must respond directly to a wide range of publics, including industry, legislators and State bureaucracy as well as local boards of education and parents. It's an inordinately complex system for vocational education. It's very different than what we're used to in the regular public schools where we're trying to adapt the school effectiveness research.

Leadership in the vocational education is defined differently that it's defined in regular public schools. Leadership incidentally for those of you who are interested in the rural variations, seems to be defined differently in rural schools than it is in urban and suburban schools.

The findings that you're probably familiar with, most of the effective schools literature, is that leadership needs to be strong and centralized. In rural schools, we find that the effective schools have shared leadership among many people. We find that the tenure of teachers in rural schools is on the average about 7 to 8 years longer than it is in the suburban and urban schools, so there's some real differences there.

Leadership in vocational education is quite different from regular public schools. Because the trade areas are so highly specialized and specific, providing instructional leadership needs a different model in a vocational center that it does in an elementary school.

I've got a few very brief recommendations that I'd like to leave you with. One, the process of improving rural schools need not be outrageously expensive. An expenditure of $300 to $400 per teacher is probably enough to begin the process in a rural State, and I emphasize that in a rural State our costs are somewhat different.

Sustained annual support of $500 to $700 per teacher is probably sufficient to provide inservice education, just the inservice education necessary to implement action plans. Meager as these resources are, they are generally not available in rural areas. Shifting burdens of local taxation couples with a decline of the agricultural tax base mitigates against such support at the local level.

I can tell you that if our budget goes down in my district today, that among the first things to be cut will be school improvement programs, the inservice phase, the courses at the university, the travel to other schools districts and the outside assistance that will be necessary to plan a school improvement program will go by the board while we try to keep class sizes down and pay the damn fuel costs.

The process of identifying effective schools must not be allowed to avoid the process of disaggregating student outcome data by social class and sex. There are many places in this country which refuse to disaggregate their data or avoid to disaggregate their data. The Department of Education must not be allowed to default on its promise to America's poor.

Inservice initiatives at the Federal, State and local levels must recognize that school improvement is a partnership involving collaboration between and among the major stakeholders. No one group, be they administrators, teachers, or their unions, or boards of education ought to have total control of the process.

Four, higher education has an important role to play as a facilitator in the process. This role has gone largely unrecognized in previous legislation regarding teacher centers in chapter 2. Five, with respect to rural education, attending to Secretary Bell's rural agenda would be a good beginning. Thank you very much.

Chairman HAWKINS. Thank you, Dr. Meyers.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I deeply appreciate your coming today and sharing with us a very excellent presentation. Unfortunately I have to rush up to listen to Eric Gilbertson from Johnson State College up in another subcommittee, and thus I won't be able to be here for questioning. I do thank you for coming and for a very excellent statement.

Thank you.

Dr. MEYERS. Thank you, sir.

[The prepared statement of Dr. H.W. Meyers follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF H.W. MEYERS, PH.D., ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR AND DIRECTOR, VERMONT SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT INSTITUTE, COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND SOCIAL SERVICES, UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT

INTRODUCTION

Prior to his departure from the U.S. Department of Education, Secretary Terrel Bell cited the need for (and Department plans for) assisting rural schools in becoming more effective.

"The Department of Education recognizes the unique and valuable contributions rural America has made to both the social and economic development of our country. In recent decades, however, the changing dynamics of our urban centers have forced public policy decisions which tend to emphasize solutions to urban concerns rather than rural concerns; this despite the fact that over one-fourth of all Americans still live—and are educated—in areas described as 'rural'."

"The Department will work to expand the data base on the condition of education in rural areas, and will provide the necessary technologies to disseminate information relevant to curriculum, organization, personnel, and support services needed for educational institutions serving rural communities. Data collection will focus on information relating to regional designation; goals of rural education and rural family education; surveys of rural curricula; test score comparison; tax base/student ratios; and descriptions of intermediate service agency delivery systems."

"The Department will provide personnel to coordinate the consolidation of available research on shortages and additional needs for analysis by the Secretary's Rural Education Committee. Research will focus on effective practices and characteristics of effective rural programs and projects."

"The Department will include rural institutions in demonstration and pilot projects, and will involve cross sections of rural communities in educational technological planning."

Source: Bell, T.H. "Rural Education and Rural Family Education Policy for the 80's." Washington, D.C.: Office of the Secretary, U.S. Department of Education, August 23, 1983.

As a researcher, teacher and member of a rural Vermont School Board, I submit to you that the promises implied to the educators of Rural America by Secretary Bell's remarks remain largely unfulfilled. If they are currently being addressed by the Department, we see little evidence of that in Vermont.

What we do have in Vermont is some evidence that the School Effectiveness Research, as articulated by Edmonds (1982), Klitgaard and Hall (1975), Miles (1983) and others, has important application in Rural Schools (Buttram and Carlson, 1983). What we need in Vermont are the meager resources that are required in order to make the applications work.

What follows is a brief description of:

1. Our rationale for applying School Effectiveness research in Vermont,
2. Our efforts in the School Improvement Institute,
3. Lessons we have learned,
4. Recommendations.

RATIONALE

In 1973, in a relatively obscure research report to the Carnegie Foundation, Robert Klitgaard and George Hall made an interesting (if not astounding) observation that only seven percent of the variation in achievement in rural schools could be explained by the standard regressor variables used in school effectiveness research (p. 69). This fact led them to eliminate the rural schools from further analysis and to speculate that the unexpected large proportion of rural effective schools in their Michigan sample might be due to the "unique characteristics of rural schools,[1] and; "the relatively large number of top schools from this region (the northern peninsula of Michigan) may be another sign that there is a rural component contributing to unusual educational effectiveness. Whether this factor reflects a statistical property of the SES measures, or a real difference in the ability or interest of rural schools to raise achievement scores, is an important question for further research."

The observations made by Klitgaard and Hall are particularly relevant to a new search for characteristics and outcomes of rural effective schools because the work on the identification of the so-called effective schools characteristics which followed from Ronald Edmonds, Lawrence Lezotte, Purkey and Smith and others was largely based on the Michigan data in the aforementioned study. Like the Klitgaard and Hall study, these studies included a heavy urban bias in sampling and analysis.

The question for us then became, to what extent can we learn what makes some rural schools effective while others are not? While we questioned the generalization of many of the correlates of urban effective schools we remained wedded to the emphasis upon pupils achievement, disaggregated by social class as the outcome measure for school effectiveness. We reasoned that by replicating the research of Edmonds, Gauthier and others we might eventually contribute to the knowledge base on Effective Schools and at the same time begin to drive efforts towards rural school improvement.

Vermont's School Improvement Institute[1] (Portions of the following are abstracted from Reaching for Excellence, a publication of the National Institute of Education).

The Vermont School Improvement Institute was created to assist local districts in improving schools through a needs assessment process and long-range planning activities. The Institute serves an outreach function linking university resources with schools, by forming a liaison arrangement with local districts in cooperation with the Vermont Department of Education.

The primary goal of Institute activities is to raise student achievement through the implementation of improvement efforts, based on a needs assessment of school effectiveness characteristics. The process focuses heavily on building internal capacity for self-analysis and plan implementation within districts, so that schools are able to repeat the process with their own resources.

PROGRAM OVERVIEW

Background

This program was an outgrowth of a prior state/university effort, "Institute for Effective Schools." Initial implementation occurred in 1981, following review of effective schools research and visits to other school improvement programs. The process is adapted from the New York City and Connecticut State Department of Education programs, and draws heavily on Gene Hall's Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM).

Procedures

Individual schools/districts can contract with the Institute for a variety of services. Contracts costs vary, depending upon school size and needs. The nine-step process begins with a request by the school administration for information on effective schools research and the school assessment/information program (Step 1). In Step 2, building staff receive this information during a presentation by program representatives. Once building staff and administration agree to undertake the assessment/improvement process (Step 3), the formal needs assessment process (Step 4) begins.

The assessment, conducted by a university team, includes interviewing all faculty, and gathering achievement data from the past few years and other archival data.

[1] Defined as less than 2500 pop.

The team presents and explains the results of the assessment to the principal in Step 5, and to the faculty in Step 6. Action Planning, Step 7, involves a small group of the building staff they review results in detail, and develop a plan for school improvement based on assessment results. In Step 8, the Action Plan is presented for building approval, and necessary revisions are made. Implementation, Step 9, occurs as necessary resources are provided by the building and central administration.

The normal expectation is that work will be sustained over a 5-to 7-year period.

Assistance and resources available

The Institute team conducts awareness presentations for administration and staff, carries out a 3-day needs assessment process, and meets twice with school committees after the assessment is completed to assist with Action Planning. A related 16-session course on school improvement is offered through the Division of Continuing Education. A 1-week awareness institute is also offering during the summer.

USERS OF THE PROGRAM

Rural Vermont districts have contracted for Institute services in nine schools (seven elementary, one middle, one comprehensive school, and two vocational centers). All districts are in the low socioeconomic status range. The student population is almost all white.

COSTS

Start-up

Current contract costs range from $2,500 (for a small school of 8 to 9 teachers receiving 40 consultant hours annually from two staff members), to $4,800 (for a 25 to 30 teachers school receiving 90 to 100 consultant hours from 3 to 4 staff members). The Institute has received substantial subsidy from university sources, and added support from grants and the Northeast Regional Exchange. Reduction in these funds in 1984-85 will probably lead to dollar costs about double those given above.

Operations

Schools may choose to provide substitutes to cover classes of committee members for biweekly meetings, organize and fund weekend retreats, or request that committee members meet on their own time. Schools are also responsible for all copying costs ($500 to $700).

LESSONS WE HAVE LEARNED

The lessons we have learned from our efforts include both what seems to be correlated with rural effective schools, and how we can best facilitate them.

THE CORRELATES

In our earlier research (Buttram and Carlson, 1983; Meyers, 1984) we discovered that most of the correlates identified by Edmonds and later by the Connecticut State Department of Education, in fact did apply to our rural schools. That is, high expectations, the use of test scores in making instructional improvement, adequate time to learn, involvement of parents and a clear school mission in our data behaved much as they had in other studies. Leadership however stood out as somewhat unique. Effective rural schools had clear strong leadership but it tended to be shared among many rather than centralized in a few leaders. Secondly, we found that school climate included more of an emphasis on the social and emotional attitudes of both teacher and children rather than the safety and orderliness issues found in the urban models.

IMPLEMENTATION

With respect to implementation we've learned that the *process* (as one of our teachers aptly put it) is our "most important product." It is the engagement of whole staff's of teachers, administrators and support personnel in the process of school change which *they* control that is our best predictor of school improvement. We find that the successful process has the following characteristics.

1. It is an *honest* response to real concerns raised in the assessment process.
2. It has both short term and long term goals and an evaluation scheme.

3. It involves substantial amounts of teacher inservice, but that inservice has a clear rationale in the assessment process. (If, for example, you ask a teacher why he or she is learning a mastery model, you get a very specific answer which links that inservice to findings of the assessment.) We have many inservice initiatives die an ugly death when they were clearly a response to a bandwagon rather than the concerns validated by teachers.

4. The process is assisted, but not controlled by an outside change agent or facilitator.

We are now in the process of adapting this research to rural vocational centers in Vermont. While we are only in the third month of field work in two centers we can make the following observations.

1. The characteristics of rural effective schools identified earlier seem to generalize to vocational centers.

2. Outcome measures include job skill performance as well as post-graduate placement, in addition to other more traditional measures of academic achievement.

3. Vocational centers, because of their regional nature must respond directly to a wide range of publics including industry, legislators and state bureaucracy as well as local boards of education and parents. Their effectiveness in these relationships seems correlated with student outcomes.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based upon our experience in Vermont we make the following:

1. The process of improving rural schools need not be outrageously expensive. An expenditure of three to four-hundred dollars per teacher is probably enough to begin the process. Sustained annual support of five to seven-hundred dollars per teacher per year is probably sufficient to provide the inservice education necessary to implement action plans. But meager as these resources are they generally are not available in rural areas. Shifting burdens of local taxation coupled with decline of the agricultural tax base mitigates against such support at the local level. Support must come from the federal level.

2. The process of identifying effective schools must not be allowed to avoid the process of disaggregating student outcome data by social class and sex. The Department of Education must not be allowed to default on its promise to America's poor.

3. Inservice initiatives at federal, state and local levels must recognize that school improvement is a partnership involving collaboration between and among the major stakeholders. No one group be they administrators, teachers (or their unions), or boards of education ought to have control of the process.

4. Higher education has an important role to play as facilitator in the process. This role has gone largely unrecognized in previous legislation regarding Teacher Center and Chapter II.

5. With respect to rural education, attending to Secretary Bell's rural agenda would be a good beginning.

REFERENCES

Buttram, Joan and Carlson, Robert. "Effective School Research: Will It Play in the Country." Paper presented at AERA, April 11, 1983, Montreal, Canada.

Buttram, Joan and Carlson, Robert. "The Implications of Effective Schools Research to the National Study of School Evaluation." Paper presented at AERA, April 27, 1984, New Orleans, La.

Buttram, Joan and Carlson, Robert. "The Implications of Effective Schools Research to the National Study of School Evaluation: Final Report." In process, 1984.

Edmonds, R.R. "Programs of School Improvement: An Overview." *Educational Leadership*, December, 1982.

Edmonds, R.R. "A Discussion of the Literature and Issues Related to Effective Schooling." Paper prepared for the National Conference on Urban Education, July 10–14, 1978, CEMREL, St. Louis, Mo.

Edmonds, R.R. "Testing and Educational Equity: The Status Quo and Prospects for the Future." in *New Directions for Testing and Measurement, Guidance, and Program Improvement*, No. 13, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, March, 1982.

Eubanks, E. and Levine, D. "A First Look at Effective School Projects at Inner City Elementary Schools." Paper presented at the American Association of School Administrators, Atlantic City, February 27, 1983.

Farrar, Eleanor, *et al.* "Volume III: Effective Schools Program in High Schools: Implications for Policy, Practice and Research." *Review of Effective Schools Programs.* Cambridge, MA: The Huron Institute, April, 1983.

Gautheir, Wm., *et al. The Connecticut School Effectiveness Project: Development and Assessment.* Hartford: The Connecticut State Department of Education, 1981.

Klitgaard, Robt. and Hall, George. *A Statistical Search for Unusually Effective Schools.* Santa Monica: Rand Corporation, R-1210-CC/RC/March, 1973.

Madaus, G.F., *et al. School Effectiveness: A Reassessment of the Evidence.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1980.

McCormack, Maureen, *et al.* "Milwaukee's Project Rise." *Educational Leadership,* December, 1982

Meyers, H.W. "Disaggregation of Student Outcome Data in Pre-Assessment: More Than A Snapshot." Paper presented at AERA, April 26, 1984, New Orleans, LA.

Miles, Matthew, *et al.* "Volume II: The Extent of Adoption of Effective Schools Programs." *Review of Effective Schools Programs.* Cambridge, MA: The Huron Institute. January, 1983.

Murnane, Richard. "Interpreting the Evidence on School Effectiveness." Working Paper No. 830. New Haven: Institution for School and Policy Studies, December, 1980.

Neufield, Barbara, *et al.* "The Message for Secondary Schools." *A Review of Effective Schools Research.* Cambridge, MA: The Huron Institute, January, 1983.

Oratz, Roz and McCarthy, Dennis. "An Overview of the Needs Assessment for a Single School." *New York City Public Schools, School Improvement Project.* New York: New York City Public Schools, 1981.

Pecheone, Ray and Shoemaker, Joan. "The Use of Multiple Data Sources to Assess School Effectiveness." Paper presented at AERA, March 20, 1982.

Chairman HAWKINS. Thank you, Mr. Jeffords, and thank you, Dr. Meyers, for a very excellent statement. As I previously said, we do not always get the view of rural school improvement programs, such as you have outlined. I think it's very helpful to some of us who are the so-called city slickers on this committee.

One question is suggested by one of your recommendations. On your second to the last page, you stated that the process of improving rural schools need not be outrageously expensive, and then you gave what appear to be rather reasonable expenditures. There has been testimony before this committee, and I will not specifically name those who have so testified, that if the improvement and reform in the schools is desired, then the people at the local level will be willing to undertake the cost of it. These same individuals have cited charts to indicate that there has been a great increase of support and funding for these activities at the State and local levels.

However, you seem to suggest that in many areas, particularly rural areas, that support is not available. Do you think the situation in Vermont is extremely unique, or do you think that the assumption is correct that if the Federal role is cut back and the funding is decreased, the States will be able to pick up the difference?

Dr. MEYERS. You ask several questions. The first question, I don't think that Vermont is unique in this respect, and I need to clarify a bit what these numbers means. There are some hidden costs in school improvement which I believe the school districts, the teachers associations, the teachers themselves and the local schools will pick up, and those include costs for the time, for example, that teachers spend outside of school, and the payment for substitutes which are part of the normal school budgeting. Schools will continue and can redirect those activities. They will continue those expenditures and can redirect those activities, so these are not total costs.

What I'm talking about in this recommendation No. 1 for rural areas are the types of costs that school districts, I think, are typi-

cally going to need over and above and moneys which are available to them at the State or local levels.

Chairman HAWKINS. What do you consider to be the Federal role in education? Do you think that that role is being vigorously assumed at the present time? Do you think there are some serious objections to what may be looked upon as Federal intervention or interference? Just precisely, what do you think the role should be?

Dr. MEYERS. Precisely, I think the role should be of leadership, but of very quiet leadership. There has been a lot of controversy about the Federal role in education at the rural local levels for sure, no question about that, and I state the Federal Government has been criticized for being interventionists for many years, and also has been criticized for beginning programs whereby school districts then have to pay the burden of the costs when the Federal dollars run out. That's been the major criticism of the Federal role.

But, this is a role in school improvement which is capacity building, which is supplementing and not supplanting local budgets, and the kind of capacity building that we're talking about over a 5- to 7-year period is the kind of capacity building that could leave small rural districts in much better shape than it found them without incurring long-term additional developmental costs. That's the role that I would prefer to see the Federal role in education.

Chairman HAWKINS. Thank you, Dr. Meyers. Mr. Kildee.

Mr. KILDEE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am a cosponsor of this bill. I think it does reflect the Federal concern which I think we'd all agree that the Federal Government should have for education. I keep saying that education is a local function, a State responsibility, but a very, very important Federal concern. I think that this bill reflects show that Federal concern.

I'm cosponsor of the bill, and I also try whenever we do try to have a new program that we dovetail that program in with existing programs. Could you tell us how this might help a local school district start a program that they might have found out about from the National Diffusion Network which I've been very much involved with?

Dr. MEYERS. Yes. I think there's a very good and specific role that relates for school effectiveness to other kinds of innovations. First of all, let me tell you about what I see as the most problematic thing about this. When people begin to talk about effective schools and don't participate in either the process or an analog to the nine-step process that I outlined in my testimony, what can happen is that an enthusiastic superintendent or an enthusiastic board member, like myself, may say to the school or to the teachers, you ought to look at this or that innovation in the National Diffusion Network, that's going to make the school better. That's a terrible, serious mistake when it occurs, because what happens is that it becomes another bandwagon, another innovation that comes down the pike, and it's the Rand Corp. study of 1978 all over again.

Teachers will give lip service to it for maybe 6 months and attend the required inservice and all that kind of stuff, and a year later, you will be able to find literally nothing of that innovation left in that school.

It's only in my mind by a long term, very carefully drawn out process where participation and collaboration by people is real, not

famed or fake, but real, that you get the commitment to something like mastery learning that will result in increased pupil achievement across the board for years to come.

I've seen mastery learning implemented in one district and have it be there for 3 to 5 years with people being very enthusiastic about it, and having the kind of school that you'd like to have your child in because they're happy. I've seen it implemented in another district 10 miles down the road, using no process at all for that implementation and watched that staff dismember itself literally in a period of 6 months, fighting over how to get out of doing this thing.

So you need to marry things like the National Diffusion Network with a process for school improvement that is systematic and careful and thoughtful.

Mr. KILDEE. Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman HAWKINS. Thank you, Dr. Meyers. The testimony has been very excellent.

Dr. MEYERS. Thank you, sir.

Chairman HAWKINS. I understand that most of our other witnesses have arrived. May I ask them to be seated at the table, and we will call on them in the order they have been listed. Dr. Benjamin Turner, director of the Kent State Center for Education Development, Kent State University; Dr. Robert Fortenberry, superintendent of Jackson public schools, Jackson, MS; and, Dr. Eric Cooper, associate director, program development of the college board. Gentlemen, we welcome you as witnesses before this subcommittee. We look forward to your testimony. We will first call on you, Dr. Turner, since you've been listed in that order, and we may indicate to the witnesses that we will have their full testimony entered in the record in its entirety. We would appreciate if you would deal with the highlights, or deal with it as you so, desire, leaving such time for questioning as may be advisable. Without objection, the testimony will be entered in the record, and we will then hear from you in the order in which we have called on you beginning with Dr. Turner.

STATEMENT OF DR. BENJAMIN TURNER, DIRECTOR, KENT STATE CENTER FOR EDUCATION DEVELOPMENT, KENT STATE UNIVERSITY

Dr. TURNER. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. My name is Ben Turner. I'm the director of the Kent State Center for Educational Development and Strategic Services. This is a center that provides technical assistance to school districts, mainly in Ohio, but additionally throughout the Nation. We began because we were charged with addressing desegregation, but what is so important about effective schools, Ron Edmonds and H.R. 747 is the fact that the effective schools concept is probably the most balanced, the most equal in terms of pinpointing the educational needs in this United States. That is the fact, and you'll hear me use this term often, is that given that all kids can learn, then all kinds should be taught, and Ron Edmonds, the great Dale Mann, Wilbut Brookover and others tried to give this concept a direction.

That is why I would like to enthusiastically support H.R. 747. It's my considered judgment that this legislation deals honestly with

59-369 0 - 86 - 2

three imperatives of public education as they exist in the United States. These imperatives are the local imperative, and that local imperative recognizes that education, of course, as Mr. Kildee said, is a local responsibility, and the local school districts are empowered to carry out these responsibilities, but we have to understand that the wherewithal for carrying out the responsibilities that will address so many concerns about our students is not always affordable based on the local school district's ability to pay.

Dr. Meyers suggested that when there's a cutback in funds, school improvement and the cost of those tend to go very early, because local school districts have to address an all pervasive educational concern. The second imperative is that State imperative, and again, as Mr. Kildee mentioned, education is a State function. However, sometimes local responsibility and State function begins to overlap and be a little confusing.

For example, State legislatures set requirements and educational directions, and the States should be commended for that, but at the same time, in terms of school improvement throughout an entire State, affordability becomes a kind of a problem, and school improvement and the cost of school improvement becomes a problem.

At the same time, the State function requires a certain communication and a certain coherence, and across the several States, that communication and coherence is not always consistent, and there is a need for synthesizing the relationship of State to State. After all, these United States, while the political boundaries and borders are there, people cross these borders, and there is an interstate implication.

Then there's the national imperative that H.R. 747 attempts to address. That national imperative comes about in many ways and in my written remarks, I address the fact the influential organizations and commissions issue a barrage of reports warning that the quality of American education has so deteriorated that the national security is threatened, a national imperative.

The National Science Board Commission made the statement that by 1995, the Nation must provide for all its youth a level of math, science, technology education that should be the finest in the world without sacrificing the American birth right of personal choice in educational opportunity. While there is the concern for science and mathematics, I think you can find that studies of the teacher supply and demand would indicate that the shortages will take place in math, physics, computer programming, chemistry, data processing, bilingual education, and so forth.

But, the thing that's exciting about H.R. 747 is that it responds to these three imperatives in a very comprehensive manner. H.R. 747 dares to make the courageous assumption that all students can be provided with the intellectual tools to live in, work in and contribute to an increasingly technological world, and by all students, we include the visible minorities, the American Indians, the blacks, the Asians, the Hispanics, but it also includes the not so visible minorities.

Therefore, there is an overriding need for planned learning experiences which are designed to prepare without exception all students to participate on equal terms in a culturally diverse society, and this participation requires universal mastery, problem solving,

problem solving and basic skills and the qualities of good citizenship for all students.

Public schools cannot limit their instructional focus to the education of the academically talented and the economically fortunate. Public schools must be effective enough to provide every child with the knowledge and skills for productive living in the 2lst century, and H.R. 747 addresses this.

H.R. 747 is a bill that respects the fact that education is a State function, and therefore, by using the process of matching, of meeting, and the process that insists that we help ourselves and the Federal Government in exercising its Federal concern will help us help ourselves is, I think, the powerful impact of H.R. 747.

Given passage of this bill, it becomes possible then to improve the quality of the Nation's elementary and secondary schools through staff development, through inservice training. There is the possibility to model professional development centers across the Nation addressing not only urban concerns, but suburban concerns and rural concerns, addressing not only teacher development, but administrator development, and the leadership, the educational leadership concern which requires now some training and development simply because leadership is not a quality that just lies around waiting for somebody to discover it.

Finally, H.R. 747 would make it possible for educators, for government, executors, and legislators to come together in order to improve public education. You won't have the strands going in so many directions. Through H.R. 747 approaches can be implemented to help educators develop a platform, a coherent philosophy, some definite goals, some clearly defined objectives related to educational effectiveness, educational equity, and educational excellence.

It is for that reason, Mr. Chairman, I think that H.R. 747 makes more sense to educators and is sorely needed, because it gives educators a chance to educate themselves.

Chairman HAWKINS. Thank you, Dr. Turner.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Benjamin Turner follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF BENJAMIN TURNER, DIRECTOR, KENT STATE CENTER FOR EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND STRATEGIC SERVICES

I appreciate the opportunity to present testimony in support of H.R. 747—The Effective Schools Bill. It is my considered judgment that this legislation deals honestly with three imperatives of public education as they exist today in these United States—the local, the state, the national.

THE LOCAL IMPERATIVE

Education is a local responsibility. Therefore, school reform should be based in the school districts, local attempts at school improvement vary with the socio-demographics of the school district and with some questionable assumptions about the root causes of problems.

There is growing concern for these groups of students who can be identified by their lack of academic achievement, truancy and conflict with the norms and expectations of the traditional public school.

The concern over these groups of students is usually expressed in terms of dropout statistics, the need to reduce unemployment, reduce welfare expenditures, and respond to the concerns expressed by social and political advocates of the disadvantaged, the minorities and the jobless. The central belief is that disadvantaged students become the core of the hard to employ and this has created both a local and national problem of social instability and dependency.

THE STATE IMPERATIVE

Education is a state function. Public schools are expected to educate the affluent, the middle class, the working class, the rural poor and the urban poor. Public schools have a variety of other important goals.

They are expected to prepare children for the work world and for *their role as* citizens in a democracy.

To this end, the states are making clear their concern for and commitment to educational reform.

Many of the states are attempting to implement school improvement initiatives based upon the effective schools research of Ron Edmonds, Wilbur Brookover, Lawrence Lezotte, Dale Mann, and Joan Shoemaker.

These initiatives range from comprehensive multifaceted approaches to highly specific, single focused programs (Allan Odden and Van Dougherty, "State Programs of School Improvement", June 1982).

State Legislatures are toughening requirements for teachers and for students. They are also increasing their formula for state aid to the local district. Unfortunately, the concern and the commitment are directly related to the economic health of the individual state.

THE NATIONAL IMPERATIVE

In the 1980's, a number of influential organizations and commissions issued a barrage of reports warning that the quality of American education has so deteriorated that the national security is threatened. These reports in conjunction with research about school effectiveness, teacher effectiveness, learning and change provide a powerful data base for addressing the major elements of school improvement.

In addition to these reports, the National Science Board Commission made this comment:

"By 1995, the Nation must provide for all its youth, a level of mathematics, science and technology education that is the finest in the world, without sacrificing the American birthright of personal choice, equity and opportunity."

However, a recent survey of teacher placement officers identified nationwide shortages in the following content areas:

Mathematics,
Physics,
Computer programming,
Chemistry,
Data processing,
Bilingual education,
Special education,
Earth science,
Biology,
English.

Teacher shortages in mathematics and the sciences are particularly severe, but other teaching areas that formerly showed surpluses are also joining the list. The shortages have immediate effects on educational quality, because they mean that courses must often be taught by teachers who are not qualified in the subject areas. (ASCUS "Teacher Supply and Demand," 1984)

H.R. 747—A RESPONSE TO THE IMPERATIVES

H.R. 747 dares to make the courageous assumption that all students can be provided with the intellectual tools to live in, work in and contribute to an increasingly technological world.

All students specifically includes the visible minorities i.e., American Indian, black, Asian, Hispanic. All students also specifically includes the not so visible minorities.

In some states, the visible minorities and the low socioeconomic groups are concentrated in a few local districts.

Other districts have few minority students or none at all.

Therefore, there is an overriding need for planned learning experiences which are designed to prepare (without exception) all students to participate on equal terms in a culturally diverse society. Such participation requires universal mastery of problem solving and basic skills and the qualities of good citizenship from all students. Public schools cannot limit their instructional focus to the education of the academically talented and the economically fortunate. Public schools must be effective

enough to provide every child with the knowledge and skills for productive living in the 21st Century.

H.R. 747 is a bill that addresses the needs and the learning potential of all of the nation's public school students. It is a bill that recognizes the fact that substantial portions of our public school population still suffer from the effects of:

Economic and social deprivation,

Racial and ethnic isolation,

Incomplete and incoherent curricular offerings,

Cultural illiteracy,

Limited articulation between educational research and educational practice.

H.R. 747 is a bill that respects the fact that education is a state function and a local responsibility. For this reason, the major emphasis is upon encouraging and assisting the States and their Local Education Agencies by providing matching Federal grants to cover those effective schools objectives which are as national in scope as they are state and local. The provisions of H.R. 747 complement and supplement state action—they do not conflict or overlap.

H.R. 747 is a bill that would make coherent the role of the federal government in providing useful and truthful information about public education. This information could then be used:

To inform policymakers including legislators, school board directors, professional organizations and teacher preparation institutions of how fundamental changes can be adapted to specific settings to provide public school students a more effective and efficient education.

To develop a computerized, centralized information exchange to be used by those schools committed to criterion referenced improvement. The information exchange would collect, evaluate, store and disseminate information that explores valid and established procedures based upon proven programs and appropriate research designs.

H.R. 747 is a bill that would improve the quality of the nation's elementary and secondary school teachers—through staff development and in-service training. The procedure would be:

To model credible professional development centers throughout the nation. These models would demonstrate various options for addressing problems and possibilities in in-service training, staff development, and dissemination of information.

To train administrators and other educators to be effective leaders.

Effective leaders in education need to know and understand the following:

The legal basis for leadership empowerment;

The organizational structure and the role relationship to all other leaders who have responsibility for educational decision making at every level;

The trends of our changing society and the need to restructure education in order to meet these changes.

Effective leaders will need to better informed in a broad range of economic, social, scientific, political, and humanistic areas. They will be required to collect, organize, and apply vast amounts of data to the problems of individuals and of organizations with the larger society.

Finally, H.R. 747 would make it possible for educators, government executives, and legislators to come together in order to improve public education.

Through H.R. 747, approaches can be implemented to help educators develop a platform-a coherent philosophy, some definite goals and clearly defined objectives related to developing educational effectiveness, educational equity, and educational excellence for all public schools.

Chairman HAWKINS. The next witness is Dr. Fortenberry, superintendent of Jackson Public Schools. Dr. Fortenberry, we welcome you. You have participated with this committee and with the Chair particularly over a long period of time. We appreciate the contribution you've made and the help that you've given to our staff.

STATEMENT OF DR. ROBERT N. FORTENBERRY, SUPERINTENDENT, JACKSON MUNICIPAL SEPARATE SCHOOL DISTRICT, JACKSON, MS

Dr. FORTENBERRY. Thank you, Mr. Hawkins. I appreciate the opportunity to meet with this distinguished committee today and discuss some things that are very positive about public education in

this country, and I appreciate the opportunity of your holding these hearings so these positive things can be said about public education.

My primary role over the last several years has been developing programs which implement research which these people have done. I think some background information is necessary before you can gain full perspective of what has occurred in the school district where I work as well as several school districts across the country. There was a time in the not too distant past when we were not doing a very good job of educating the children, some of the children. We were doing a very good job of educating some children. Some children we were not doing a very good job of educating. The school districts of this Nation were traumatized by desegregation. It was a necessary movement in this country. It was necessary both socially and morally. It was done, had to be done, but it did have some effects on school districts across this country.

There was the trauma of white flight, transfer of teachers and students. The effective schools movement has been a primary tool in helping us move through that period of time and building better school systems across this country than we've ever had before for all the students.

We had to acknowledge the fact some several years ago that there was a changing clientele in our school districts, and more and more of the client was that student with which the school systems of this Nation had not done a very good job of educating.

Our school district is not an atypical one of urban school districts. The majority of the students are poor, minority, inner-city youth, and they're children of single parent families. According to statistics, that causes the children to be disadvantaged.

So often, we have been taught to believe that we should establish lower expectations for these students, but I'm glad to say the effective schools movement is causing us and has caused us to see that we can develop demanding, rigorous programs, and all students can and are learning in those programs, that it is improper to establish lower expectations and lower standards for students of the poor.

We had to re-examine what we were doing and re-evaluate our instructional programs, and guided by the effective schools research, we made drastic changes in every area of our school program. We had to decide, first of all, what it is our children need to be told, and through the effective schools research, we have guided our school district into action and a lot of others to help the educators see that if the children are not learning, it is the fault of the institution and not the fault of the children.

We have a responsibility in education not only to present the information, but we have a responsibility for outcomes also. That is a new and different approach and one that has not been totally accepted in my profession.

The premise of the effective schools movement that all children are educable, and that that educability occurs at the school, not what occurs at home, and this is well documented in the effective schools research.

As the chairman has mentioned, the primary characteristics of these schools, and we follow Edmond's five characteristics, five correlates, the principal is a strong instructional leader, and the

schools' major purpose is to see that learning takes place, and there is a clear instructional focus around that purpose. The school is orderly, a safe climate, and there's no signs of institutional neglect.

There is high expectations of all students, and there is frequent measurement of student achievement so that we can intervene in those places where students are not learning. The key to implementation of all of this, and our primary role in the movement has been, the development of a series of interrelated programs. A lot of research has been done, but our role has been to take that research and build a series of interrelated programs, a uniform nonoptional curriculum for all students.

If you believe all students can learn, you need to put that philosophy in action by having all students in the first grade taught the same curriculum or second grade or Algebra I is Algebra I is Algebra I.

The second program has to do with the Systematic Staff Development Program. It is necessary for those of us in education to make significant changes in our behavior if we're going to put into effect the effective schools movement, and the Systematic Staff Development Program, as Bud and others have talked about, is essential in getting that job done.

A uniform grading system, some technological assistance in managing the data, a very thorough planning program built around the correlates and a process of involvement called shared governance, all of this is working together. We've seen significant results in the school district. We've seen our test scores on the California Achievement Test move from the 25th percentile to the 70th percentile in those grades where we tested, significant growth in 10 years.

We've seen the number of merit scholars and achievement finalists go up significantly. We've done the disaggregation, Bud, that you've talked about, and that is a significant piece to determine that our rise in test scores is not just something that occurs for one group of people, but for all our students. About 80 percent of our kids are going on to advanced study. Our children last year earned academic scholarships of over $2.5 million. The dropout rate is going down, while the achievement curve is going up. The failure rate, that is the number of children retained in grades, is going down rather than going up. There has been a drop in the number of children which has been separated from school for serious discipline problems.

These things are directly attributable to us putting into effect the educational reforms of the effective schools movement. Another significant area of gain has been the renewal of community support and faith in Jackson public schools. In less than 20 years, there were people in our community calling for the abolition of public schools, and now the chamber of commerce pledged to raise an educational trust fund of $2 million.

There is a Concerned Biracial Citizens Committee, a community council. There's a speakers bureau. All of our schools, all 56 of them have been adopted by businesses in the community. This has resulted in our community because we have used the effective schools model to implement some educational reforms that is clear-

ly demonstrating that regardless of who the children are, whether they're black or white, whether they're rich or poor, whether they're handicapped or whole, when they come through the schoolhouse doors, it is our responsibility to teach them, and we are, in fact, teaching them. This movement needs a national thrust through H.R. 747.

I fear that we're being called up at this time to make a choice between excellence and equity. My one plea to you is that we can have neither without the other. Thank you very much.

Chairman HAWKINS. Thank you, Dr. Fortenberry.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Robert N. Fortenberry follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF DR. ROBERT N. FORTENBERRY, SUPERINTENDENT, JACKSON MUNICIPAL SEPARATE SCHOOL DISTRICT, JACKSON, MS

I sincerely appreciate the opportunity to speak before this distinguished committee about the success we have experienced in Jackson, Mississippi because of the effective schools movement. I am especially grateful to Chairman Hawkins for having these hearings so that the positive occurrences in public education can come to light.

Before you can fully appreciate the impact of the Effective Schools Movement, I believe I must first explain the reasons it has become the vital link to our remarkable improvements.

Yes, there was a time when we didn't do a very good job educating all the children.

Public schools were faced with the challenge of continuing education during desegregation, which had ill effects such as white flight and problems relating to teacher and student transfers. Some school districts are yet to recover from this trauma. But we're on our way thanks to the Effective Schools Movement and the great wisdom of its pioneers—Ron Edmonds, Larry Lezotte, and Wilbur Brookover.

Our turn for the better began six years ago when we acknowledged that we had some serious problems. We realized that from the start, public education had catered to upper and middle income people. However, as the Jackson metropolitan area began to change, so did our clients. A majority of the students today are poor, minorities, inner-city youth, and children of single-parent families. They are the disadvantaged.

There was a time when educators lowered achievement expectations of these students, but that is no longer true in Jackson Public Schools. To meet the needs of its clints, Jackson Public Schools began some very demanding, rigorous reforms so that all children could learn.

School administrators re-evaluated the effectiveness of the instructional program and decided drastic changes were needed in every area of instruction.

We decided to confront head-on the problem of teaching certain children. And with this commitment, we discovered a body of research which provided the foundation for our massive educational reforms.

That body is the effective schools movement, which proclaims the philosophy that every child can learn and that every teacher is responsible to see that learning takes place.

The premise for the Effective Schools Movement—that all children are educable and that educability derives from the nature of the school attended—is based upon well-documented research showing common charateristics of effective schools.

Those characteristics have been validated by Edmonds, the father of the movement, and other researchers.

The researchers, found that—regardless of their location, resources, or compostion—effective schools have the following common characteristics:

The principal is an instructional leader;

The school has a major goal or purpose that is known by all adults associated with the school;

The school has an orderly, safe climate in which there are no visible signs of institutional neglect;

Expectations for all students' achievement are high; and

Measurement of pupil achievement are a basis for evaluation of programs as well as student progress.

A series of inter-related programs have grown out of our commitment to provide all children with an effective education.

The programs include:

A uniform, nonoptional curriculum for all grades called the Common Body of Knowledge.

Systematic staff development of ALL employees so that everyone understands that their job is vital to providing quality education.

A uniform grading system through which all students in the district are tested for mastery of objectives with district-constructed tests. Those tests also carry the most weight in the final grade.

An Instructional Management System grades the tests by computer and maintains a sophisticated record-keeping system, which provides teachers and principals an analysis of student mastery.

A five-year planning and evaluation program through which all areas must set goals, plan implementation and evaluate success.

A shared governance process has teachers, parents, administrators and staff working together in decision-making.

All of this is working. We know it is because we've had some notable results. Constantly rising test scores and student academic achievement tells us we are on target.

In the last few years we have seen student scores on national exams rise from far below the national average to far above. This year alone we have 19 national merit and achievement finalist.

We're seeing more and more of our students seek higher education. Last year 80.04 percent of our graduates went on to advanced study. The 1985 graduates earned more than $2.5 million in academic scholarships for advanced study.

Approximately 200 students won state, regional or national awards last year.

I know that these significant academic gains are largely due to the sweeping educational reforms based on the Effective Schools Movement.

As a result of these gains, we're seeing a renewal of community support and faith in Jackson Public Schools.

The Jackson Chamber of Commerce has pledged this year to raise four million dollars to start an education trust fund for the public schools.

A 21-member Community Council of concerned citizens has become a Speakers Bureau for the school district, and has asked the city for a 25 million dollar bond issue to improve our buildings.

And all of our 56 schools have at least one corporate adopter—and many have multiple adopters—through the Adopt-A-School program.

We are receiving very clear signals that we should continue with the Effective Schools Movement. We're convinced that without this movement, finding this valuable research would have been impossible and our remarkable improvement would have never happened.

Chairman HAWKINS. The next witness, and I'm taking them as they came into the room, Dr. Dale Mann, and then we'll have Dr. Cooper. Dr. Dale Mann, we appreciate your appearing before the committee today, and all the support which you've given to this committee and to the chair over a long period of time. It's a great privilege to have you testify. I believe you, along with Dr. Edmonds, more or less gave a start to this idea on this committee, and it's a privilege to have you come back and pick up that leadership again.

We regret that the late Dr. Edmonds was unfortunately removed from this particular scene at a very early age, but certainly you've carried on in a remarkable way, and we certainly appreciate what you've done.

STATEMENT OF DR. DALE MANN, TEACHERS COLLEGE, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

Dr. MANN. Thank you, Mr. Hawkins. This is a real privilege for me. In some ways, it completes a circle which had begun in the work of Ron Edmonds. I have to say that H.R. 747 is probably the second greatest testimony to the work of Ron Edmonds in the work of public schools. Obviously, the first greatest testimony to Ron Ed-

monds' contributions is the kind of enthusiasm, the projects and the gains for the children which are going forward in many places around the United States, that are using effective schools ideas, not only at the State level, in county systems, in public school systems, but also in thousands of school buildings.

I, because of what I do for a living as a professor at Teachers College, Columbia University in New York. I have an opportunity to pay some attention to the research bases on which this bill is founded. I think it may be helpful to contrast the research base on which this bill is premised with the circumstances that were underneath education legislation as recently as 20 years ago.

When Richard Nixon was President of the United States, he appointed a thing called the President's School Finance Committee taking the position that he might be willing to pay for more things for public schools, but he wanted to be assured that the things that he paid for worked, that the things that the Federal Government was going to support would, in fact, make a difference in the lives and the futures of the children of America.

In pursuit of that, the President's Commission on School Finance commissioned an extensive analysis of all of the literatures that purported to find any kind of a relationship between what school people were doing, what principals were doing, what teachers were doing in classrooms, and anything the children were achieving.

That report which was done by a man named Averch came up with what I regard as the single saddest sentence ever written about public schools. Averch's sentence in summary is that research has not identified a variant of the existing system which is consistently related to children's educational outcomes.

There is nothing that could be found based on a national and an international analysis that if you changed it in the system would, in fact, help all children learn more. Averch wrote in 1976 his data were accurate to about 1974, the way the question was asked and given the state of the art as it then existed, I think it was accurate, although the consequences are pretty serious.

I think Averch is no longer correct. As I read the evidence, there are a number of things which we know, which we can describe, which superintendents and leaders like Bob Fortenberry from Jackson, MS, have, in fact, put in place, and when you put those things in place, they make a difference for kids.

We know the dimensions of effective schooling. Coleman is no longer correct. Jencks is no longer correct. Averch is no longer correct. The people who have argued that mere schools cannot help children are increasingly incorrect.

What we have in the effective schools idea is a kind of a value added schooling. Value added schooling is not unlike the same notion which exists in the business sector or in the private part of our enterprise. If somebody has a business or a shop or a service operation, they're buying goods, they're buying labor, they're buying things at one price. They do something to them in their operation, their factory. They buy it at one price and they sell it at another.

What went on in the middle is that they added value. For the public school, the question is, isn't it the case that we can describe kids as they come up the steps. Isn't it the case that we can de-

scribe teachers and how they should be teaching, and we can describe a curriculum such that if you put the kids, the teachers and the curriculum together, those children are going to be able to perform things in addition to what would be their lot if we knew simply one fact. What kinds of families do they come from? What are their social or demographic characteristics?

The value added school is a school that says, if you tell me what kind of families you're serving, if you tell me the backgrounds of the child, I can accept the responsibility of helping all children learn more than would be the case if we simply knew that one thing.

Now the value added idea, and it underlies the idea of the effective school, the value added idea is one which puts a similar challenge before schools of all sorts before schools serving not only children from low-income families, but those from middle-income circumstances and also those from more affluent circumstances.

It is an idea which comes very close to the democratic aspirations of a public school system, and as I have suggested in the testimony that I prepared for the committee, you will see that those ideas are based on three major streams of research. Those streams of research are beginning to converge, and they all point in the same direction.

We have research, for example, on effective teaching. We know how teachers should proceed, how they should present lessons, how they should group children. We know what effective teaching looks like. The second research stream has to do with basic research on, if you will, the psychological processes of schooling, and the third research stream comes from the laboratories, the research and development centers, the other activities which have been doing what's called programmatic research and development. They have been trying to translate the basic research base into packages, into transportable activities, into things which can be adopted and which can be used to support better practice around the country.

Effective teaching then, basic research and finally programmatic R&D, much of it coming from the Federal labs and the centers are the three research streams which are beginning to coincide. One of the things that I find so interesting is that those research streams not only coincide, they also converge with what good practice has shown us over the years.

There's a very real sense in which the effective schools research bases is the same as the base derived from the commitment and the hard won insights of practitioners and leaders in the best schools around the United States.

It is an interesting convergence, because instead of having to force something into being, instead of having to try to bludgeon somebody into doing something, we have as one of the few occurrences in public schools, the academic community, the empirical community agreeing with the practical community about what the dimensions of a more powerful effective school should be.

It's also the case that H.R. 747 could augment some things which are currently underway in the executive branch. I am conscious, as I'm sure the committee is, that today Mr. Bennett is releasing a document called "what works," which is a compendium of 11 points, 22 precepts, 11 ideas that are abundantly well supported by

research and which characterize good schools, and they are suggesting them to the attention of parents and school people around the country.

As I read those 11 points, I see in the majority of those points, the same ideas which are the underpinning of H.R 747, and so again, there is a helpful kind of coalescence. As well, the Office of Education, Research and Improvement decided when it was competing the research centers in this last year, decided to dedicate two of the new research centers to effective schools ideas.

There is now at the University of Wisconsin at Madison a center, a research center on effective secondary schools, and at Johns Hopkins, there is also a newly established Federal research center on effective elementary schools.

When you look at the research, and when you look at the good practices that characterize the schools with the kind of value added power that we are now talking about, schools which are able to say whatever kind of child comes up the steps of the school, I can work with that child, and especially for children of the poor. I don't have to hide behind the fact that the family is poor, the family may not turn off the television set, it may be a family headed by a female, the family may not have all the advantages of a middle-income family. Regardless of the family background characteristics, the school can accept the challenge of helping all children learn at the same rates and the same stability.

Now, at the beginning part of my testimony, I refer to a number of places around the country that have had some remarkable gains in the achievement scores and the accomplishments of the children in those districts, and the districts run, as Professor Meyers has already explained, from rural circumstances to urban circumstances. They are suburban, they are exurban, they are big, they are little, and they are all getting the same kinds of results.

They get those results, because of what we know about what delivers this kind of schooling. Ron Edmonds talked about five factors. He believed that there were five factors which, if put in place, would produce an effective school. I well remember when Mr. Edmonds came to New York and gave a press conference in New York, he said to the assembled media in the city that he wanted to be judged according to what happened for the lives and fates and fortunes of the bottom one-third achieving children of the city.

He bet his reputation, the progress of the schools and those children on the fact that there would be five factors, and if you put them in place, you can get this kind of schooling. Those factors are, as I have looked at them in a piece of work that I did for the National Institute of Education and its predecessor self, and through them for the school finance group of the National Institute of Education, those factors being with teacher characteristics and behavior.

The most important of the variables that's delivering effective schools is teaching and what happens in classrooms. The second of the most important factors is administrators, superintendents, principals, the leadership variables that exist at the district level and at the building level. They are followed by ideas about a learning climate in the school, ideas about the adult working circumstances of the school as those adult characteristics bear on what

children are able to do. Fourth, pupil evaluation procedures, it's clear that you can't have an effective school unless you measure effect, and then finally, curriculum materials.

With regard to curriculum materials, it is the case that there are a number of different texts, there are a number of different publishers, there are a number of different packages of materials which will support effective schools work.

Those five factors, as I read the evidence, are rather unambiguously present in schools which have the kind of value added properties that we are now discussing.

We need support. I frequently have the experience of going to school districts and doing the workshops and othewise working with people who are interested in these ideas and who would like to bring them to their school districts.

Unfortunately, there are a lot of places around the United States that don't have the kind of capability, the kind of leadership, the kind of dedication as Jackson, MS, public schools have. They cannot or they will not make the sort of major investment in the infrastructure, in the systems, in the activities sustained over time that will change the practices of those public school districts, and so what typically happens is a district listens to a daylong workshop and inservice activity. People go away. They go away someplace between enthusiastic and at least convinced that perhaps they should listen to these ideas. Maybe they ought to do something, maybe there is something new here, maybe there is something better. They go away from that workshop and they go back to the school that is unorganized to support those ideas. They go back to the school that doesn't have the teams necessary to do the planning and delivery. They go back to the school that it not able to support an effective schools program.

That's a shame, because we have the attention of American education now, and we have the research and practical basis to support a different kind of a public school, but it is going to require some money. It is going to require some investment. It is going to require the thoughtful and systematic kind of presence which is clearly anticipated in H.R. 747.

As I look at what is represented in the effective schools movement across the country, it is clearly a movement. There are now more than 2,000 jurisdictions, public schools, buildings, county offices, States, using the effective schools ideas already. Unfortunately there are 15,000 public school districts out there, and so while we have managed to persuade 2,000 of them that these ideas are of use, there is a considerable amount of work to be done.

The States, many of the States have used the effective schools paradigm, the five factors model to support State level reforms. Again, you can mandate something. You can try to persuade somebody about something, but it requires more systematic, more programmatic attention that is currently available.

As I read the provisions of H.R. 747, it is the difference between what we now have and what we should have. It's a beginning, and I'm delighted to have the opportunity to comment on the prospects for this legislation. Thank you.

Chairman HAWKINS. Thank you, Dr. Mann.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Dale Mann follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF DALE MANN, PROFESSOR AND SENIOR RESEARCH ASSOCIATE, CENTER FOR EDUCATION AND THE AMERICAN ECONOMY, TEACHERS COLLEGE, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY NEW YORK, NY

SOME EVIDENCE ABOUT EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS

The duBois Elementary School in Northern Wyoming enrolls 200 children, all from blue collar families, many are native Americans. Five years ago, a fourth of the children scored at or above national norms on standardized achievement tests; today in reading, 84 percent are at or above these norms; in math, 66 percent are at or above national norms.

The Prairie View Elementary School in Lake View, Michigan, serves a working class community: on the Michigan State Department's mastery tests, 97 percent of the children have achieved mastery in math and 94 percent in reading.

Duval County, Florida, moved its 98,000 students from 56th place to first place among Florida school systems in both communication and mathematics skills. The largest gains came from Black students whose performance on the State's mathematics functional-literacy test increased by 229 percent (EDUCATION WEEK, March 7, 1984, p.4).

Appoquinimink, Delaware's public schools serve a rural population that is poor but, using the Achievement Directed Learning program from a federal laboratory (Research for Better Schools in Philadelphia), the district moved from seventeenth to second on the State's comparative ranking of all Delaware districts.

A school enrolling 80 percent Hispanic children in one of Newark, New Jersey's most depressed neighborhoods has gone in seven years from 22 percent of its children reading at or above national norms to 77 percent; from 31 percent at or above national norms in mathematics to 80 percent. The school now has a 90 percent average daily attendance, up from having been among Newark's worst. Seven years ago, a parent night drew 70 parents; this winter, 1240 parents showed up on a single night.

Similar gains can be documented from around the United States and are part of the reason why effective schools techniques are featured in the Education Department's recently released report, "What Works." The growing power of the techniques that can deliver more effective schooling are also reflected in the decision by the Office of Education Research and Improvement to concentrate two, newly funded research centers on the implications of effective schools for elementary and secondary schools.

To those encouraging developments, we should add the widespread use by State legislatures of effective schools techniques to frame state reform efforts and the more than 2,000 effective schools projects now underway across the United States.

But public schooling is provided through 15,000 school districts and 85,000 school buildings. While effective schools techniques have the potential for widespread improvement, they are not in use for all the children that might otherwise benefit from this more powerful way to provide teaching and learning.

THE RESEARCH BASE

H.R. 747 is premised on a strong research base with three converging streams of inquiry. First, "outlier" studies are describing differences between schools dealing with poor children that are otherwise similar except that some are successful and others are not. These inquiries focus on the school building and its correlates. The second type of study comes from program evaluations especially from Federal laboratories. Basic research on the teaching process is the third area contributing to this question of the "instructionally effective school" (i.e., a school whose practices can diminish the interaction between social class and achievement). Recent gains in the schooling achievement of children from poor families have come from matching the teacher's instructional style to the child's learning style, from diagnostic-prescriptive "micro-teaching" evaluation sequences, and from maximizing direct instruction (when teachers teach, children learn). Many of these properties are present in Bloom's Mastery Learning techniques; most represent a more sophisticated understanding of the behavioral research on teaching and learning and how that varies systematically by social class.

The research base for the instructionally effective school gets manifested in school practice. One five-part typology has become widely accepted. In some places that configuration is known as "Five Factors Theory" and is usually attributed to the late Ron Edmonds. In my recent study for the National Institute of Education, the contribution of each factor to the instructionally effective school was estimated by a panel of experts as follows:

FACTOR GROUPS RANKED BY MOST TO LEAST CONTRIBUTION TO THE INSTRUCTIONALLY EFFECTIVE SCHOOL

Factor	Rank
Teacher characteristics and behavior	1
Administrator characteristics and behavior	2
School learning climate	3
Pupil evaluation procedures	4
Curriculum materials	5

SOURCE: Dale Mann with Judith Lawrence, "A Delphi Analysis of the Instructionally Effective School" (report for the School Finance Project of the National Institute of Education; Teachers College, Columbia University, June 1983, p. 5).

Finally, it should be noted that the five factors that have been supported by the research and endorsed by practitioners, are also the framework for assistance to be provided through H.R. 747, the "Effective Schools Development in Education Act." That act can bring major improvements to all children, but especially to those from low income families who have no alternative to an improved public school.

Chairman HAWKINS. The final witness is Dr. Eric Cooper, associate director, program development of the College Board.

Dr. Cooper, we appreciate all that you have done in participating in our education groups, and the great contribution that you have made to this subcommittee. We look forward to your testimony. Dr. Cooper, if I may interrupt, Dr. Meyers had previously testified, and I think we did question him. He has indicated he might have some district difficulties today. Dr. Meyers, if you would like to be excused, we obviously would like to accommodate you. So don't feel compelled to remain if you think that your duties require you to be elsewhere.

Dr. MEYERS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I've done about all I can do for that district today. I'll know at 7 o'clock tonight whether or not we have a district.

Chairman HAWKINS. As you so desire. Dr. Cooper, we look forward to your testimony.

STATEMENT OF DR. ERIC COOPER, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT, THE COLLEGE BOARD

Dr. COOPER. The realities of school systems. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I thank you for this invitation to testify, and I appreciate the work you've been doing in support of education. Now, as probably all of you are aware, I'm a new face. This is the first time I've testified anywhere as it relates to a body. Whoever put me last, I want to thank you. I never had a problem with high blood pressure. I now do, I'm sure of it, especially after following these gentlemen's excellent testimony.

Now, upfront, I don't want to seem like a heretic in some of the things I'm going to say today, though many might interpret it as such. I am a supporter of the effective school movement. I think that it has added much to what we've been able to accomplish in education across this country. I just have some questions.

Upfront I must add that I'm not appearing today as a spokesman for the College Board or I'm not supporting a College Board position which represents about 3,000 colleges and universities and school systems across the country. I believe the President would have my head if I said the statements I'm about to make are based upon positions at the College Board.

They are, however, my positions as it comes from the vantage-point of working with numerous urban and suburban school systems across the country for several years now. Now, as I indicated to you, what I've seen that is encouraging is that the effective school movement has started us this Nation in a proper direction, but we're not going far enough. One of the key frameworks for Ron Edmonds' work is that teachers need to have high expectations for students.

I do not believe, based upon my observations and based upon the things that I've seen, what I've read in the literature that, in fact, we maintain high expectations for students in this country.

Now, to bolster my position being a newcomer, I've come armed with some data. It is reported in the literature, and it's widely reported, it was reported by the ex-Secretary of Education at several conferences, reported for the past 10 years, that the single primary forces behind what drives education in this country is not the administrator, it is not the teacher. It, in fact, is tests and textbooks or instructional materials which are used in the Nation's schools. We do a lot of research, and we look at a lot of factors, and they're all, I think, having an impact on achievement in the schools. I know there is some achievement occurring as represented here by these gentlemen.

But, 90 to 98 percent of instruction in this country, it is estimated is driven by instructional materials. Now you might say, so what, Eric. Well, let me just build this further.

Eighty percent of the knowledge students are exposed to comes from textbooks, and in a recent study, students were given inappropriate material 75 percent of the time. In a Long Island school system, they found that 80 percent of materials in grades 3 through 12 were inappropriately matched to the academic needs of the students.

Researchers have found that 70 percent of allocated instructional time is spent on workbook type exercises. Most of the time, as we've seen in our observation, and my presentation today is primarily instructional in terms of its implication, leads to some recent studies that indicate the following. Goodlad in a study of high schools has found that less than one percent of instructional time is spent in the classroom on engaging students in a question responding mode. Most of the time is spent listening to lectures, as we're doing today.

Students are not engaged in an active way that allows them to begin to learn or use higher order thinking skills. Now the results of all this, it is estimated that approximately one out of three Americans are unable to read with comprehension.

The only national study that's looked at across-the-board sampling across this country of students, they have found that students have learned to deal with such tasks as literal comprehension, recall, memorization, lower order tasks in terms of instruction, but are unable to deal with higher level comprehension and higher levels of thinking.

In fact, we know that in some urban populations, 50 percent of the students are dropping out. Well, from a study that we've done in correlating our data with the national assessment data, of the 25 percent of those students are retained, 25 percent of them are

unable to read with comprehension the local sports section in the local newspaper which translate into an inability at the high school level to read beyond the fifth and sixth grades.

If you look at the data that's emerging from effective schools, you see a growth up to the sixth grade and then you see a precipitous dropoff. I believe that one of the reasons behind that are low expectations. All children can learn, yes, but all children have got to be given the right to learn through proper mediation, and unless we begin to focus on higher order thinking skills, we're going to prepare our graduates of education to take part in the McDonald's of the world, and I'm not knocking McDonald's. I would like to see students graduating from our schools with the ability to analyze, with the ability to reason, with the ability to comprehend, with the ability to think.

We're not graduating students with that ability. In fact, a researcher has reported that by the fourth grade, students have reached their plateau in terms of elementary reasoning skills, and that in college, many are performing at the same level or even perhaps lower than they were in the fourth grade. I believe that we need to begin to refocus our attentions, and I think H.R. 747 is an excellent bill that can help us refocus this on the development of teaching skills, on the development of the skills that will enable our students to graduate and become active members of this society in the tasks that are demanded by the future tasks of computers, science, mathematics and the like.

It is estimated that in the school year in Japan, one-third of teacher time is spent on staff training, but in this country, only one-half of 1 percent of the time is invested in teacher training. Now with that as a foundation, I have a series of recommendations. I indicate to you upfront that I feel that testing programs and textual materials drive instruction in this country.

I feel that, one, as a suggestion, we need to begin to choose testing programs which facilitate comprehension and cognitive instruction. There seems to be a national obsession with testing, and you might say that seems to be funny coming from one of the largest testing agencies in the world, but it's true. We seem to be obsessed with testing data.

It is suggested by Ted Sizer that we correlate or we associate our forcing ahead toward excellence by increasing the tests we give students, but as Ted Sizer has suggested, quote, "This seems to be a non sequitur. It is like saying we're forcing ahead with the elimination of cancer by improving the quality of the pathology lab. Testing is not and cannot ever be considered a remedy. It's only part of the problem, rather than a solution."

So we need to begin to choose more appropriate testing programs that allow schools to begin to set high expectations for students.

Two, we need to provide support for long-term staff development which allows teachers and administrators the time to learn new strategies during the school year. We cannot expect that the training of teachers ends with undergraduate or graduate education, and I believe that it would be nice in H.R. 747, if it is not so already, to earmark funds for that very nature. Now, examples of how to, implement this can be found throughout the country. They can be found at the Schendley Training Center in Pittsburgh, or in

Kansas City, MO, public schools' collaboration at the University of Missouri, Kansas City Campus, in Levittown, NY, in Chicago public schools or even in New York City public schools within a project that Dale Mann has headed.

So we need to stress long-term staff development, not the short-term staff development where somebody comes in, like a Dale Mann, and presents an excellent day of research and application, gets the staff excited, and then disappears.

We need to create long-term involvement in the schools, and it is replicated over and over again in the research. To do this, we need to look in terms of school change at a collaboration, a collaboration with outside agencies and with the inside staff who are serving the students.

Three, we need to simplify the programs used to serve students. Naisbitt suggests, John Naisbitt suggest that we're drowning in information, but we're starving for knowledge in this country. We should avoid information overload in schooling and stress the aphorism that less is more as is done over and over again, by people such as Ted Sizer.

Four, as I indicated before, we need to provide grants that support collaborative efforts among school systems, colleges, universities and educational agencies, and, five, we need to advocate programs which have been found to improve the comprehension and cognitive development of students. We need to avoid those which isolate and fractionate instruction.

Now, I've heard one program in particular mentioned, the mastery learning program, and I have been working with the developers of that program. They themselves admit that if one agrees to follow the letter of the law as laid out by the master learning curriculum, you end up with isolated and fractionated results in terms of learning by students.

We need to critically analyze the programs that supposedly have support data behind them. We need to analyze them based upon the expectations that they have for our students. All our students can learn to learn. All our students can be taught to think, but because of the programs that we're using, innovative programs, because of some of the testing instruments that we use to drive instruction, our students are not learning how to think. I think it is absurd for one-quarter of the population in our urban school populations approximately to be unable to read beyond the sixth grade, and it's even more absurd when a superintendent of a major school system in the central part of this country indicates in the paper that one could not have or one should not expect urban children to perform beyond the sixth grade reading level.

They cannot read beyond the sixth grade reading level, he is implying. That makes me very angry if you hear it in my voice. I'm going through a process of catharsis right now, especially when I have this opportunity and you are a captive audience.

The point of my presentation is that we need to begin to redefine what exactly is occurring in education at this country. We need to look at the Fortenberry models which are excellent in their beginnings. We need to begin to maintain higher standards for all our children, not just the majority of our children, and we need to provide the funding which supports this, and only unless we redefine

what education is all about, not all children can learn without proper mediations, we're dropping the ball, and we're only beginning the game. Thank you very much.

Chairman HAWKINS. Thank you, Dr. Cooper.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Eric J. Cooper follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF DR. ERIC J. COOPER, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT, THE COLLEGE BOARD

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I thank you for this invitation to testify and appreciate the work you have been doing in support of education. I am appearing today not as a spokeman for the College Board, or to support a College Board position, but as an educator who has observed and worked with school systems across the country. What I have seen from this vantage point both encourages and discourages me. I am encouraged by the sheer energy of some teachers I have seen working with this nation's students, and yet discouraged by numerous inconsistencies in the instruction I have also observed.

What I find most discouraging is gained through observation and is also widely reported in the literature on school reform. Consider the following data:

1. It is reported that 90–98 percent of instruction is driven by instructional materials . . .

2. 80 percent of the knowledge students are exposed to comes from textbooks . . .

3. In a recent research study students were given inappropriate material 75 percent of the time based on their academic needs . . .

4. A Long Island school system found that 80 percent of materials in grades three through twelve were inappropriately matched to the academic needs of their students . . .

5. Researchers have found that 70 percent of allocated instructional time is spent on workbook-type exercises . . .

6. Researchers have discovered that students often spend more time on workbook activities than engaged in instructional activities with their teachers . . .

7. In a large analysis of high school instruction, a well-known researcher discovered that less than 1 percent of instructional time was spent on students responding to questioning posed by teachers . . .

8. It has been estimated that one out of three Americans is unable to read with comprehension . . .

9. Approximately 50 percent of student populations in certain urban areas are dropping out of school and 25 percent of those students who persist are unable to read the sport section of the local newspaper . . .

10. A researcher has reported that by the fourth grade, students have reached their plateau in terms of elementary reasoning skills, and that in college many are performing at the same level or even perhaps lower than they were in the fourth grade . . .

11. It is estimated that one-third of teacher time in Japan is spent on training teachers; in this country only one-half of 1 percent is invested in training and staff development.

Despite the implications of these data there are reasons for optimism. One level of hope is provided by research on effective schools. There is much that is laudable about the effective schools movement, i.e., its impact on administration, teachers and students. At the same time there are serious questions which need to be raised. The purpose of my testimony today is to raise these questions and provide some models which I and others feel speaks to the question of what an effective school is or can be.

I begin with an assumption. I assume that schools exist to teach students how to learn. That may appear self-evident, but not everyone necessarily agrees with such a statement. For example, in Florida, people have argued that schools exist to teach students how to pass a test—the state's SSAT-1 and SSAT-2. In New York, many may argue that instruction is focused on helping students pass the Regents and in other states it is argued that schools exist to help students pass competency tests or that they exist to help students through the equivalent of a G.E.D. No matter how good the test, let us remember that the test is not the same as learning and should not be the primary fuel used for driving education towards some level of what we call excellence.

Teaching students how to learn is essentially different from teaching information, teaching to memorize, teaching to take a test, or teaching any other skills not related to the how of learning.

Yet beyond the how of learning, there is a lot of other activity which takes place in schools, much of it fine and worthwhile, much of it mandated by state or local agencies, governments, authorities, and professional advisors. But as I am sure you will agree, at the heart of schooling is learning, and at the heart of learning is the issue of how learning may best be developed to meet the needs of students.

Over the last decade we can be more concrete about that direction, since we have continued to gain knowledge about the how of learning. Yet it is also over this decade, that researchers such as Hammond have pointed out that ". . . between 1972 and 1980, use of teaching methods that might encourage the development of higher order thinking abilities, such as project or laboratory work, writing tasks, and student centered discussion, delcined in public schools." You many ask why this occurred. The reasons Hammond gives in this report, submitted to a gathering of educators in Florida last year, are simple: instruction was driven by tests, textbooks and curricular, which focused on minimal skills, not the skills which can lead to higher order functioning by students.

This present day focus on lower order skills as driven by tests and textbooks, is a problem that is facing all educators. For if schools have been identified as effective based solely on tests which stress lower order and isolated skills, they do not (in my eyes at least), qualify as effective. If the researchers are correct in their finding that education in this country is in fact driven by tests and textbooks focused on lower order skills, such as vocabulary development, literal comprehension and rote recall, the question has to be asked: Are we creating an educational climate which prepares the student for a career path or merely for a job which does not force the employee to think, to analyze or to perform beyond a minimal level of performance?

If you will, let me relate the implications of this to the effective schools movement as it has been put into practice by some school systems.

Effective schools make a distinction between tests that are used for accountability and tests that are used to support instruction. True accountability requires tests of outcomes of the educational process. Instruction, however, requires test instruments that support individual teacher efforts and must reflect the instructional objectives being taught. Occasionally, the same test can serve both functions. More likely, however, is that a test for one will not serve well for the other. For example:

A teacher may need to identify particular student strengths and weaknesses in reading. A test of particular skills in reading may serve this teacher well. The same test, when required of all teachers through the school wide testing program, may encourage the teaching of discrete skills through drill and practice at the expense of comprehension. And there is no evidence that drill and practice on the skills of reading or writing improves the student's ability to read or write. Teachers must have the freedom to pursue the teaching process. Undue concern over the impact of the school testing program simply hinders effective teaching of learning. And the mastery of isolated skills of a discipline like reading or writing is not the outcome desired from our instructional efforts.

The New York State Education Department and the Connecticut Department of Education have statewide testing programs in reading and writing that serve as models for other states and schools to follow. There are four factors related to instructional testing programs that need to be considered. First, the outcomes of reading and writing are assessed as directly as possible without resorting to the isolation of numerous proported skills of reading or writing. The New York and Connecticut testing programs recognize the complexity of reading and writing and concentrate on asking students to master outcomes—not isolated skills.

A second factor in these testing programs is that clearly stated expectations are set for schools and students. Expectations based on rational standards may provide an edge for introducing into higher schools an emphasis on order skills rather than lower ones. Effective schools must be effective for all students—not simply a particular segment of the student population. While we may point with pride at the fact that all students reached the minimum closer inspection reveals that on one is served well by such minimums. Meaningful standards and expectations must be clearly stated and effectively implemented if we are to prepare students for success following schooling.

A third factor in these testing programs is continuity. For the public we serve, as well as the students and parents, continuity in testing is critical. Without continuity, individual as well as school progress cannot be demonstrated. Continuity here means a consistent way of defining what is meant by reading, or writing, and a consistent way of assessing each across the grades. Comparing students to national norms is not sufficient to demonstrate progress. Student performance must be assessed at regular intervals so that growth can be determined, and the New York and Connecticut programs are designed to do this well.

The final element of testing for effective schools is that the results can be used by administrators and teachers to support curricular and instructional efforts—support but not prescribe. One way this can be accomplished is to have tests that assist in the selection of instructional materials that are appropriate for the students served. Using instruments that can assess both students and material can facilitate the textbook adoption and utilization process. Given the wide variety of instructional materials available for students, test results need to support teachers' attempts to must the needs of students. In many systems, curriculum development is written at the district level by staff who have little knowledge of the students they are writing for. Rather than twisting students to fit and often ill-conceived curricular focus, we need to develop curriculum based on individual student needs using technology which supports comprehension and cognitive instruction.

From my vantage point, I have viewed schools which have been labelled as effective, but sadly they have stressed the teaching of isolated intellectual skills rather than functional ones. By functional, I mean skills that can be incorporated by the student into effective strategies for bridging the gap between what they know and don't know.

Intelligence and learning should be defined not as what the student knows, but what he or she does when they dont know what to do. To accomplish this, we must begin to change the drivers of our educational systems, i.e., tests and textbooks which support a fractionated approach to learning and which motivate a child to ask, "will it be on the test." When students ask will it be on the test, they probably can't find any other good reason or purpose for learning the subject matter. We must provide them with the reason for learning by engaging, challenging, and motivating them. This is not accomplishing by teaching to a test of minimal skills or through the use of materials which emphasize these minimal skills.

Suggestions on how to develop effective schools abound. The most promising approaches are emerging out of cognitive research. This research has provided us with a new fuel for supporting an acceleration towards improved schools, yet it has thus far had remarkably little to do with improving instruction in this country. This research provides us with a window of opportunity for improving schooling:

1. Choose testing programs which facilitate comprehensive and cognitive instruction. Based on what seems to be a national obsession with testing, it is suggested that we are forging ahead toward excellence by increasing the tests we give students. As Ted Sizer has suggested "this is a nonsequitur, it is like saying we're forging ahead with the elmination of cancer by improving the quality of the pathology lab." Testing is not a remedy; it's often part of the problem rather than a solution.
2. Provide support for long-term staff development which allows teachers and administrators the time to learn new strategies during the school year. We cannot expect that the training of teachers ends with undergraduate or graduate education. Examples of how to implement this can be found at the Schenley Training Center in Pittsburg or in Kansas City, Missouri's Public Schools collaboration with the University of Missouri/Kansas City campus, in Levittown, New York, in Chicago Public Schools or in New York City Public Schools.
3. Simplify the programs used to serve students. John Naisbitt suggests that we are drowning in information, but starved for knowledge. We should avoid information overload in schooling, and stress the aphorism that less is more.
4. Provide grants that support collaborative efforts among school systems, colleges, universities and educational agencies.
5. Advocate programs which have been found to improve the comprehension and cognitive development of students—avoid those which isolate and fractionate instruction.

These strategies and recommendations emerging out of research and observation indicate some of the directions, some of the approaches many school systems are using across this country. They can, if used with other strategies, deliver effective instruction necessary for diverse student populations. These can lead to what I like to call a "new mainstream" for the development of effective schools. That new mainstream brings together the new research on cognition, an understanding of how students engage themselves in the learning process, and the delivery of instruction for all students. That mainstream consolidates guarantees of student competency with support to extend learning to the limits of a child's potential.

This is the inherent philosophy serving as a foundation for the new mainstream, and it is this philosophy which also provides the sources for improving schooling. It is a philosophy which is color and gender blind, a philosophy which is derived from a celebration of this country's differences in its citizens, and one which focuses instruction both on interactional and individual needs.

These are not the only suggestions I might list, nor are they the only examples of exciting innovative programs existing throughout the country. There are many other examples and many other strategies for teaching and learning which could serve as models for these responsible for educational policy and funding. I have stressed the previous examples because they are common signs, and commonly ignored in many, too many school systems.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you again for this opportunity to testify and would be pleased to answer whatever questions you may have.

Chairman HAWKINS. The chair would like to share some of the time with other members. I have several questions, but just in the event that we may be limited, may I yield at this time to Mr. Kildee?

Mr. KILDEE. I'll pass to Mr. Owens.

Chairman HAWKINS. Mr. Owens? Well, the chair would like to say that we certainly, I think, have had wonderful presentation of the statements. We seem not to be in disagreement, and I think, Dr. Cooper, I don't construe your remarks to be in criticism of what has been said by the other witnesses. I think they fit within that context.

The committee has been quite diligent in seeking out schools across the country, looking for models that have succeeded, and certainly most of the witnesses today, I think, have documented what we have verified very well across the country that many schools are actually succeeding. This obviously has been the basis on which H.R. 747 was introduced.

The main opposition, as I see it, to a proposal of this nature comes primarily from the Department of Education rather than the outside. I have not had the opportunity to read the Department's new study, "What Works." I do intend to go to the White House this afternoon to listen to the report itself, and hopefully have the advantage of some comments. The Los Angeles Times apparently has the inside track on the study which I unfortunately don't think the members of this committee had. I would like to just quote from the Los Angeles Times and to ask the witnesses to respond.

According to the Los Angeles Times, the study by the Education Department's Research Division advises parents of poor children to create a, "curriculum of the home," by providing books and supplies, monitoring television time and observing routine for meals, bedtime, and homework.

When parents of disadvantaged children take such steps, the report says, "Their children can do as well at school as the children of more affluent families." Of course, that comes as a great observation that would be pertinent to the chair, because it seems directed to the parents of my district who are suffering many disadvantages who may or may not have television, obviously. The meals may not be so great, and there are some who are struggling to put food on the table.

The bedtime may be somewhat disorderly, because there are many kids in my district who are fighting over what they call bedspace. There's a lot of children sometimes in the same bed.

The parents many times can't read. Of course, they are disadvantaged because many of them are certainly from a one-parent family. However, the thing that I'm not too sure about, and I certainly hope to get the answer this afternoon, is how these children

can do as well under these circumstances, as well as the children of more affluent families.

Now I would like to ask the members of the panel, beginning with you, Dr. Mann, just how does this fit in with the effective schools approach, which says that in spite of these disadvantages, we expect the schools to do a reasonably good job of overcoming the disadvantages as opposed to putting the entire burden on the parent.

Hopefully the parent will be able to read. Hopefully the parent will be able to provide some of these advantages to the child, but in many instances, the parents cannot for various reasons do so, and just where does that leave us?

Dr. MANN. Mr. Hawkins, I labor under a peculiar disadvantage. I don't have access to the Los Angeles Times, and therefore, I have to make do with the New York Times. However, your point about parent involvement and a curriculum in the home is well taken.

The counsel that is in the "What Works" document from the Education Department is good counsel for all parents. It isn't simply for parents who come from low income circumstances. The point I think that is important to remember about the effective schools idea is that, however, that regardless of the kind of family background from which a child may come, the school can still aspire to bring the same kind of learning to all children.

See, it is a common observation in schools on the part of professionals that the parents won't turn off the TV. I can't get the mother and father to come and sign the homework. There's only one person in the home if anybody is at home. What can I, a mere teacher, do? What can I, a mere school principal, do?

The challenge of an effective school is the challenge of a democratic school. Public schools do not get to choose what kind of children come up the steps of the school, and they must educate all children from all circumstances.

I think everybody at this table certainly would wish for all children a supportive family, of a nuclear family, an intact family, a family with a lot of resources, but that isn't the case for all the children. What can be the case for all the children is an effective schools idea can, to use Ron Edmonds' phrase, attenuate the relationship between low income and low school achievement, such that children from low income families can learn the same things, certainly with respect to basic skills acquisition, can learn the same things with the same rate and the same stability as others.

I would, if you'll permit, like to make one more comment, and that has to do with the relationship between effective schools and something else which is very much on the public's mind, and that's dropouts. It has been estimated that if you take a class of dropouts in the United States, the lifetime income that they will forego because they dropped out is $320 billion.

If you subtract from the $320 billion the amount of taxes that they will not pay, because they dropped out, you find that they will not pay to States, to the Federal Government and to local jurisdictions $71 billion in taxes.

One way to think about that is we could spend $71 billion on programs like H.R. 747 will support and break even. I would recom-

mend that to everyone's attention. I don't know that we're going to actually see that.

The dropout class in the United States is 700,000 kids a year. That is the equivalent of the entire student population of the State of Minnesota every year. Every year through dropouts, we lose the entire population of the State of Minnesota. Now, I've been doing an amount of research on dropouts and on early school leaving, and I think among the things that people agree on is that the solution to early leaving of the secondary school, the answer to dropping out of high school is to have more effective elementary schools, and to build a base that is like the base that's anticipated in H.R. 747.

Chairman HAWKINS. The chair is a little confused on the $320. What did that amount represent, Dr. Mann?

Dr. MANN. That's the amount of income that those children as adults will not earn. It's income foregone.

Chairman HAWKINS. Thanks. Would any of the other witnesses care to respond to the subject which I introduced? Yes, Dr. Fortenberry.

Dr. FORTENBERRY. There's been an age old bit of folklore that's been reinforced by educational training from time to time, and that is the relationship between learning and social class.

We have often, education protected ourselves by predicting certain children would fail; therefore, when they did fail, we were not overly concerned, and I fear that blaming the home for the failure of learning is another attempt to reinforce that mythology.

There's ample evidence in place across this country that if we don't know who the children's parents are, if they live in a shoebox, that we have the responsibility to teach them, and they can be taught.

There is nothing in the effective schools research which ever indicated we should take away the advantage of the middle class, and we would wish that for all children, but to use the home as an excuse for not learning flies in the face of a great deal of research and a great deal of program—information we get from programs that are in place across this country today.

So we do not accept as an excuse for children not learning the kind of homes from which they come. It is our responsibility to overcome that.

Chairman HAWKINS. Any of the other witnesses? Mr. Owens?

Mr. OWENS. I have another question, Mr. Chairman, that relates to the presentation of Dr. Cooper. I'd like the other panelists to comment on what seems to me to be an omission if testing and textbooks are a driving force in the education process. How can you ignore it when you lay out your factors for effective schools, improving schools? Do I understand correctly?

Dr. TURNER. If the factors are laid out in terms of effective schools, one would have to go back to a number of statements made by Ron Edmonds as he was trying to help us think through the process. He referred to the fact that accomplishments have to be measured, and throughout this Nation, one principal measure is the test, and he stated that very clearly upfront.

He left it for some of us to make the Gestalt, and let's figure out how to tie these correlates to measurement, testing as it were, but

also reminded us that there are other measures. Now, research and practice must address this reality. Dr. Cooper stated that very clearly, perhaps not strongly enough, because like death and taxes, tests seem to be three in terms of the guarantee. Tests are going to be with us. Therefore, there are some things that we have to do. We have to, we in education have to establish that relationship between curriculum content and tests. We have to identify certain other measures that in addition to tests relate to indicators of educational processes.

It's not that effective schools ignore these. Perhaps in the interest of time, there is still yet a time to do the research, to follow the Cooper recommendation that, yes, let us find out more about the teaching/learning process. Let's build up this.

But, you know, what was so beautiful about that statement, it fits in exactly with the thrust and the direction of H.R. 747 which should be able to enable us to begin to think in higher order terms about the process of education, about the process of educational delivery and about the fact that there will be a test out there somewhere that will be confronting these children when they go through certain educational programs.

Given the passage and the enactment of H.R. 747, then all of these great researchers and practitioners and educators can come together and address the very thing that you're talking about, Mr. Owens.

Mr. OWENS. Yes, Dr. Meyers?

Dr. MEYERS. About 5 years ago, the Institute for Research and Teaching at Michigan State, the IRT had a project called the content determinants project which many of the teachers who become involve in the school effectiveness improvement programs very quickly become aware of, and the reason for that is when you disaggregate the outcome measures, the reading and mathematics test scores, the question immediately becomes when some children are not achieving as they should, why is this so.

Well, there are a couple of very quick and possible obvious answers to that. One is that the children simply are not being taught effectively. The second possibility is that the tests and the curriculum are not well matched, so that which is being taught is not being tested, or vice versa. This immediately forces teachers and administrators into an examination of the curriculum, and it's matched to those measures that are being used in effective schools programs.

So our experience has been that far from a de-emphasis on curriculum, the first step after the disaggregation of the test scores is an examination of the curriculum and materials in our schools. Now, that may not be happening all over the country, but in our institute, this is what has occurred.

Dr. FORTENBERRY. I think that Eric wants us to go to step four before we've gone by step one, and I think there's a building process through which we go. I think the kinds of things he laid out are very good. I'm not sure how far we are along that route in most school districts across the country, but I really hope that your admonitions are heard very widely.

Dr. COOPER. I have to respond. I guess what I'm challenging is not the machinery in terms of how one proceeds for analyzing how

one matches students with a particular instructional or curricular focus. I am questioning and challenging the inappropriate use of technology that in my opinion forces us into a lower ordered mode as it relates to achievement for our students.

I question some of the procedures that are used in school systems that arrive at the curriculum objective referencing procedures that are often done when one calls it curriculum alignment, meaning you take curriculum objectives and align them with certain outcomes that you have in mind.

I think what we need to begin to look at clearly is the research as it relates to how those objectives are developed, whether or not, in fact, they truly are outcome based, and I think outcome based meaning the ultimate goals that we would expect students to have.

For an example, in my testimony, I indicate especially in the area of reading, in line with some of the instructional approaches in this country, there is an overemphasis on a certain amount of skills in the area of reading. There is no research, not one thread of evidence which supports the isolation of the objectives as laid out in all of the curriculum approaches across this country, and I say all, especially in the commercially prepared programs, which translates into the student's ability to integrate all of this knowledge so that he or she can apply this in a way that allows them to begin to analyze and reason.

I think that Bob Fortenberry is absolutely right. I do think that effective schools is a step in the right direction. I think we are moving. I just think that one does not have to wait for step 2 and step 3. One of the problems with curriculum translation as it relates to some of the best research done by people like Benjamin Bloom at the University of Chicago, is that you have a taxonomy and you proceed through this taxonomy from lower order skills to higher order skills. Now that is bastardization if you will of how curriculums should be developed in terms of outcomes, because you can teach students lower order skills as you teach them higher order skills such as evaluation.

I want to provide the opportunity for all of our children in the Nation's schools to be able to graduate with the ability to think and to reason so that they can make choices for themselves, to move beyond the traditional boob tube approach which gives us all of the information that we possibly can need, including the Sesame Street approaches, that we are geared toward entertaining students rather than teaching students.

So my challenge is not to challenge any of the approaches here, as Chairman Hawkins has identified. It's just to ask us to begin to look at where we begin to put our money in terms of research on outcomes on expectations that truly demand and challenge all of our students, and not the students in the high tax bracket communities throughout this country, but for those urban study, and to rid us of superintendents who maintain low expectations for the students, as that one superintendent does in the central part of our country.

Mr. OWENS. Just quickly, were you implying that there's a separate set of tests for students in higher income brackets throughout the country, that we don't use the same tests there that we use in other communities?

Dr. COOPER. No; I'm not implying that. As Dale Mann says, if he says it's true, I think it might lead to that as an outcome. I think what the problem is——

Mr. OWENS. So the right tests do exist already?

Dr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. OWENS. The tests that you want?

Dr. COOPER. Yes, and they are being developed by States such as New York and Connecticut and the State of Michigan are looking at this change, because the literature is saying and has been saying for 15 years or more, but it takes education a long time to catch up with that literature.

However, it's the machinery, it's the decisionmaking properties. Why do we choose one test versus another? Very often, it's because of the hard sell of a commercial publishing company and not based upon the merit of that assessment tool. It is, as I repeat, test and instructional materials which drive instruction in this country, and I believe it is built into Edmonds' correlates, primarily because he had these very wide flung correlates that enable one to put into those categories certain attributes and characteristics of the area that I'm talking about, but one needs to look at how one begins to select these things, because what you imply can occur absolutely and does occur in school systems across the country.

One last statement, at a large administrative conference, it was acknowledged by one of the presenters that school administrators do, in fact, look for the performance instruments that their students will do better on versus another performance. But, when it all is said and done in terms of choosing whatever instrument, the ultimate indicator is how well are students prepared to become part of the everyday work force.

When a superintendent from the Midwest indicates that all we need to do is prepare students for sixth grade reading comprehension across subject areas, I would indicate to him that in our research, we have found for clerical staff to do well in this country, they have to be at least performing at a first-year college level in terms of comprehension. So I would hope that when we begin to carefully look at the analysis that we use for maintaining what we call an outcome-based approach to instruction and achievement. Thank you.

Mr. OWENS. Thank you.

Chariman HAWKINS. Well, it was my understanding at least from observation of some of the schools, particularly those in my own district, classified as effective schools that the testing referred to as one of the correlates is a continuous process. It isn't just a test of final accountability in some distant future, but it's done in some of the schools that I visited on a weekly basis, and there is testing not only of the students, but also the teaching to the student, and perhaps testing the teacher as much as the student. That's been at least my impression. If that isn't true, I wish that I would be corrected, because that's been my impression.

In other words, there isn't a distinction made between testing to support instruction and the testing to be used in the final analysis for the purpose of accountability. There isn't that distinction as you seem to have indicated.

Dr. COOPER. If I may respond, I would hope that we would use evaluation versus singular assessment approaches. When all is said is done, there are a series of criteria that I believe that school systems use, but the predominant one that always emerges is the test results. Superintendents come armed to bear with a series of data that are related to a particular testing instrument.

My question is with that particular instrument, not with an approach for evaluation or assessment, and I think that the technology is available. State departments are aware of the problem, and are looking at the problem and are working on the development of higher level tests of comprehension.

I believe that up to the sixth grade there are some appropriate tests that are available. However, I've heard many so-called experts and teachers who are experts, by the way, not just researchers, not just people who are housed in colleges and universities, indicate that they would hope that students are asked to perform analysis, evaluation at the elementary grades as well as the secondary level.

It is a problem that I see in remediation in dealing with those students who haven't learned at the elementary level, that we go ahead and repeat what's failed for them at the elementary level, put it in a different package and repeat it over and over again. I would daresay if there is anything, because my background comes from special education, and I had to deal with those students who were performing very low, what brings the student into a special education class is failure and poor instructional mediation.

I do believe that schools make a difference. I would hope that parents would support that process. I do feel that ultimate responsibility falls on a collaboration and a partnership between the home and the school and I think to meet our role as educators, given that label, we need to be very careful about how we choose instruments and make the proper use of instruments in a series of evaluation approaches.

Chariman HAWKINS. Dr. Meyers, I think you were seeking recognition?

Dr. MEYERS. Yes; Eric, I think, raises a good point about the application of the technology by the test companies which some of us are beginning to become concerned about. I know in our State, at least one test company, not one that he's associated with, is now beginning to market its tests on the basis of a discrepancy index between ability and achievement on an individual pupil basis which flies in the face of most of what I think we know about psychometrics. It's very disquieting, because it's being bought and sold in the marketplace as part and parcel of school effectiveness and school improvement. It may be an application of the technology which is a spinoff in this time of enthusiasm about how one could improve schools which could set us back a good 5 years, in my judgment anyway.

Chariman HAWKINS. Thank you. Dr. Fortenberry.

Dr. FORTENBERRY. Thank you. I think most of the school districts across the country which which I've worked in relation to building a curriculum, that they do bounce their objectives against Bloom's taxonomy, and we've done this on many different occasions, and our objectives go far beyond simple recall.

The majority of our objectives go far beyond simple recall, so any kind of good objective bank is bounced against Bloom's taxonomy so that the instruction is not limited to simple recall, but does go to analysis, evaluation, and the other kinds of things.

That is one safeguard against a simple recall curriculum.

Chariman HAWKINS. Again, the Chair would like to thank all of the witnesses for their excellent testimony. I also would like to take this opportunity to commend you for the contribution that you are making in your particular areas of the country. For your information, we will have a meeting with the ranking minority member of this committee pertaining to H.R. 747. Mr. Goodling has a proposal that attempts to bring the parents and children together in a program that is somewhat comparable to Head Start which he calls Even Start. It is possible that we may be able to, in some way, tie these proposals together, but we do intend to recommend a bipartisan approach to this problem, this session. In spite of Gramm-Rudman and some of the other negative things, we want to make some headway.

The contribution that you're making in your various areas certainly will be the type of thing that we believe will present an opportunity for this Congress to not only respond to the negative things that are happening in education, but hopefully to advance something that is positive and uplifting.

Your testimony this morning is of tremendous help to us, and we certainly appreciate the contribution that you've made. Thank you very much.

[Whereupon, at 11:42, the subcommittee adjourned.]

59-369 (48)